

CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION
LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

DEC 17 1931

The Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE
WEST AND SOUTH WITH THE COOPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL
ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION
OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XXVII

JANUARY, 1932

Number 4

Editorial: Translation à la Mode	Frank J. Miller	241
Martial and the Roman Crowd	John W. Speath, Jr.	244
Early Roman Understanding of Christianity	Erwin J. Urch	255
The General Speaks — a Comparison of Greek and Roman Methods of Leadership	Dorothy M. Roehm	263
Conflagrations in Ancient Rome	H. V. Canter	270
Note		289
The Roman Horseshoe	A. D. Fraser	
Book Reviews		291
Frank Burr Marsh, <i>The Reign of Tiberius</i> (Sage); Edward Kennard Rand, <i>The Magical Art of Virgil</i> (Prescott); La Rue Van Hook, <i>Greek Life and Thought</i> ² (Murley); F. R. Earp, <i>The Way of the Greeks</i> (Murley); Mari Ruest Hofer, <i>Festival and Civic Plays from Greek and Roman Tales</i> ² (Lawler); H. St. J. Thackeray, <i>Josephus, Jewish Antiquities Books I-IV, Vol. IV</i> (Radin); Roy J. Deferrari, <i>Saint Basil, The Letters, Vol. III</i> (Tracy); Horace Leonard Jones, <i>The Geography of Strabo, Vol. VII</i> (Robinson); James Turney Allen, <i>The First Year of Greek</i> ² (Agard).		
Hints for Teachers		307
Current Events		315
Recent Books		319

PRINTED AT
THE TORCH PRESS
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the cooperation of the
Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association of the Pacific States

Editor-in-Chief

ROY C. FLICKINGER
University of Iowa

ARTHUR T. WAGNER
University of Kansas

Editor for New England

BRYAN M. GALT
Brown University

Editor for the Pacific States

ARTHUR P. MCKINLAY
University of California at Los Angeles

Associate Editors

FRANKLIN S. DAVIS
University of Chicago

EDWARD CROW
University of North Carolina

DANIEL W. LOTHMAN
East High School, Cleveland

W. A. ELLIS
Lehigh, Pa.

FRANKLIN J. LARSEN
University of Iowa

WALTER MILLER
University of Missouri

CLARENCE W. VERMILION
Stanbury High School, Illinois

IRVIN A. SCOTT
Northwestern University

ELLA A. GILSON
University of Wisconsin

Business Manager

ROY C. FLICKINGER
University of Iowa

JOHN BARKER STEARNS
Dartmouth College

Correspondence should be addressed as follows:

Concerning Manuscripts and Book Reviews: in general to Roy C. Flickinger, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. But manuscripts from the New England States should be sent to Bryan M. Galt, Brown University, Providence, R. I.; from the Pacific States to Arthur P. McKinlay, University of California at Los Angeles, Calif.

Concerning Special Departments: to those named at the head of each department.

Concerning Membership in the Association:

In the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, to J. O. Loftberg, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O. For the states included in this Association, see the inside of the back cover.

In the Classical Association of New England, to Morton M. Wetmore, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

In the Classical Association of the Pacific States, to Fred L. Farley, College of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif. The states included in this association are California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona.

Concerning Subscriptions: (of those who are not members of one of the associations named above), to J. O. Loftberg, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O.

Concerning Missing Numbers: to J. O. Loftberg, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O. Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and so far as the reserve stock will permit.

Concerning Advertisements: to Roy C. Flickinger, Business Manager, Iowa City, Ia.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL is printed monthly except in July, August, and September by The Torch Press, Cedar Rapids, Ia. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for service of less than a year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Bolivia, Columbia, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Ecuador, Brazil, Philippines, China, Japan, Formosa, India, Shanghai. For all other countries in the Postal Union, an extra charge of 25 cents is made on annual subscriptions (total \$2.75) on single copies 7 cents (total 33 cents).

The mailing charge in each of the associations named above is \$2.00 a year, with the addition of 25 cents a year for Canadian members, for postage. This fee includes subscription to the JOURNAL at nominal rate. See back cover page.

Twenty-five reprints are furnished free to the authors of major articles, book reviews, and essays. Additional reprints, if ordered in advance, are supplied at cost. Orders for additional reprints should accompany the corrected proof.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Cedar Rapids, Ia., on October 16, 1922, and additional entry as subscription matter at Cedar Rapids, Ia., under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 16, 1922.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XXVII

JANUARY, 1932

NUMBER 4

Editorial

TRANSLATION À LA MODE¹

Since the earliest memory of even the oldest of us the use of a translation in construing the daily allotment of text has been under the ban. Deprecated, frowned on, forbidden by teachers, put outside the pale of good educational method, pilloried by opprobrious epithets such as, "horse," "pony," "trot," "crib," it still continues in use, *sub rosa*, to be sure, but unremittingly active. Like those hardy perennial sins of our boyhood, card-playing, dancing, smoking, theater-going, which, though sternly forbidden by the elders, were yet secretly and persistently practised by the young, this forbidden habit goes on, harmful in itself, but more harmful because done under cover and against rules, and hence with a bad conscience on the part of the student.

In the matter of the proper treatment of this practice we may well take a leaf from the history of the practices already mentioned. These four "deadly sins" are no longer counted deadly and, with few exceptions, are not viewed as sins at all. The bars have been lifted; and the worst thing about them, their sneaking secrecy, has vanished, as being no longer necessary. When par-

¹ This is peculiarly a topic where the maxim *Quot homines tot sententiae* applies. For another but somewhat similar point of view cf. Keith Preston, "Translations and Translators," *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* XIV (1920), 242-44.—R. C. F.

ents, instead of forbidding, actually join with their children in enjoying these things, frankly avowing that they have many good and innocent features, the way is laid open to an equally frank discussion of the features to be deprecated and avoided.

So with illegitimate translation helps. Have we not made the mistake of branding these as altogether evil and sternly forbidding them, thus sending our students, in secrecy and ignorance of their undeniably proper use, to a consorting with the worst class of such translations and to an ignorant and damaging use of them? Would it not be better, since all too many students *will* use translations anyhow, frankly to admit the translation to open use in the classroom and have a really good translation at the teacher's desk for the use of all the class? Let the teacher discuss with the class what a really good translation is and how any student may hope to make one. Can this be done by slavishly and habitually following a clumsy interlinear translation with no attention to the finer points of diction, striving only to work out a translation that will "get by"? Or even if a better translation is used, if this is used to the exclusion of the exercise of the student's own powers of memory and judgment, of insight and taste, is he advancing at all toward the goal of the ability to make a good translation of his own?

But perhaps we have been giving an undue emphasis to translations, have been making translation the be-all and end-all of the recitation; and perhaps it is because of this that the "horse" has got his evil head so deeply into our pedagogical manger. In the early years of our course in Latin, the first, the second, and even the third, while the translation of Latin into English is properly required of students, this at the early stage is not at all or at least not mainly for its own sake. Translation in its early stage is a means to an end. It is but a help to the learning of the language itself. This learning of the language, this learning to *use* the language, includes, first of all, the acquisition of a considerable Latin vocabulary; and second, the way in which these words are put together to make consecutive speech (syntax). These are the great, the important ends in early Latin study. If truly gained,

the key to the understanding of all Latin literature, whether translated or not, is secured.

Now in a class where translation is not exalted as the main objective but is used only as an illustration and practice of Latin words and their relation in continuous speech, there is no place for the "horse." The ground is literally cut out from under his feet. The student must descend to earth and use his own powers if he is to advance at all; and in so using them he gains additional powers.

The upshot of this homily is: (1) bring the use of translation out into the open by removing the ban upon this method of study, and by having a good translation available to all the class; (2) show how habitual leaning upon the borrowed help of a translation, good or bad, dwarfs the growth of one's own ability toward that end, but how the occasional and intelligent use of a really good translation as a model and inspiration toward good work can be, openly and avowedly, of great service to the student; (3) put the illegitimate use of the "horse" out of business, not by forbidding it or punishing it, but by making it valueless.

FRANK J. MILLER

MARTIAL AND THE ROMAN CROWD

By JOHN W. SPAETH, JR.
Wesleyan University

The epigrams of Martial have long served as a rich source of supply for those who would seek a more intimate knowledge of life as it was lived at Rome in the first century of the Empire. This is quite as it should be, for Martial was one who freely obeyed his own command to live in the present¹ and at the same time he had been endowed by nature with a keen sense of vision and an agile mind, which he used with unsurpassed success in describing what he saw and experienced. The simplicity and sparkling vividness of his little poems make them immediately appealing and expressive. His vignettes of Roman life are based upon a familiar background into which they naturally merge; but oftener than not this is true because of the very wealth of detail which he himself has supplied. Both by virtue of necessity and by deliberate intent the epigrammatist knew life at close range and from that knowledge derived both entertainment and a livelihood. No one knew the contemporary scene better than he; no one observed it with so professional an interest.

Moreover, if it be objected that Martial's pictures are too frequently vitiated by exaggeration, the result of prejudice and a straining after effect, it must also be acknowledged that the character of the man is so clearly revealed in his verse that the exaggeration can easily be discounted by the discerning reader. For Martial's prejudices are seldom so deep-seated as to be very vicious; Juvenal erred much more in that direction. The epigrammatist scanned the surface, wearing his heart on his sleeve, so to speak, and submitting to no close philosophic attachment. His

¹ Cf. I, 15, 12: *Sera nimis vita est crastina: vive hodie*; also v, 20; v, 58; and viii, 44. The references in this paper are to W. M. Lindsay, *M. Val. Martialis Epigrammata*: Oxford, Clarendon Press (1902).

interests were generally broad rather than deep. It was thus that he touched life closely at all levels and was enabled, by his gift of pointed expression, to invite his many readers to a feast of such richness and variety.

Representatives of practically all walks of Roman life are mentioned and criticized by Martial in the course of his fifteen books. Sometimes the mention is a brief one; in other cases the poet is moved, more often by animosity than by sympathy, to give his pen freer play. Of the sixty or more Roman occupations, high and low, to which he alludes there are very few which find much favor in his sight. In an earlier essay² I presented his views on doctors, teachers, lawyers, and poets, about whom he permitted himself considerable eloquence. The purpose of the present paper will be to follow the poet's course as he ranges more widely through the heterogeneous Roman mob, in the fora, the Subura, the parks, and the porticoes, making note as he passes of each flagrant example of vice or folly which may serve him later as the subject for an epigram.

Let us turn first to the world of the petty tradesmen. These were in many cases slaves or freedmen who acted as agents for their betters. There were all sorts, but for Martial they might all be lumped together as necessary evils that must be tolerated. And yet the poet admits that some of them at least, like the butcher, barber, and taverner, are indispensable aids to a livable existence. The noisy baker (*pistor*), like others of his genus, robs one of an hour or two of sleep before daybreak (XII, 57, 4f), a heinous sin for which Martial can never forgive him.³ Then there is, too, the crafty taverner (*copo*) who tries to sell his cheap wine unmixed with the more precious water (I, 56; III, 57). At this rate, thinks Martial, it is about time for him to be giving a gladiatorial show to his native town, as a cobbler and a fuller have already done for theirs (III, 59). Even book-sellers (*bybliopolae*) are thriving beyond their deserts. Tryphon is selling Martial's thirteenth book (the collection of *Xenia* or "Guest-Gifts") for twenty cents,

² "Martial Looks at His World," CLASSICAL JOURNAL XXIV (1929), 361-73.

³ Cf. IX, 29; IX, 68; X, 74; XII, 18; and XII, 68, 5f.

whereas at half the price it would yield him a decent profit (xiii, 3). But, in passing, the poet pays to the book-dealer Quintus Pollius Valerianus the compliment of remarking that it is through him that his poems are not permitted to disappear from public view (i, 113); and, for advertising purposes, he informs us that another of his publishers is Secundus, freedman of learned Lucensis (i, 2).

The depth of degradation is very nearly reached when one descends to the level of the petty huckster. Wishing to be especially abusive to one Caecilius who has dared to regard himself as a man of polish and wit, Martial likens him to the common street vender and much else besides — the hawker who trades sulphur chips for broken glassware (x, 3, 3f), the peddler of pease-pudding, the vile slaves of the salt-fish merchant (*salaris*),⁴ the raw-voiced purveyor of smoking sausages (i, 41). The foul debauchee is merely in the same category. The dealer in slaves (*mango*) offends by his greed (ix, 5, 4) and still more by the din he makes (ix, 29, 5). This was a combination that Martial could not stomach. The self-imposed pomposity of the merchant (*negotiator*) in Agrippa's Saepta (x, 87, 9) and the frenzied haste of the business man in the fora (viii, 44) move him to scorn. He is prompted to warn Titullus, as he observes him rushing about from forum to forum in the busy hours of the morning, sweating and mud-bespattered, that his wealth is an evanescent thing after all: "Plunder, hoard, pilfer, possess; you must finally leave it all."⁵ How the poet exults in the edict of Domitian that forbade these pushing fellows to overflow the whole street in the ambitious promotion of their trade! Thanks to the emperor, no longer must a praetor tramp through the mud in the middle of the street; no longer does the reckless barber brandish his razor dangerously close to the ears of pedestrians, nor the smoky cook-shop (*nigra popina*) monopolize most of the walk. "Barber, taverner, cook, and butcher (*lanius*) are keeping

⁴ Or it may be "sellers of salt"; cf. iv, 86, 9f. The more usual term for sellers of salt-fish is *salsamentarii*.

⁵ Cf. viii, 44, 9: *Rape, congere, aufer, posside: relinquendum est.*

to their own thresholds. Now Rome actually does exist; recently it was but one huge shop" (vii, 61). This world of business was not for Martial. It was too noisy, too nervously busy, and too undeservedly profitable; on these grounds alone it would justly have merited our author's unrighteous indignation. But, in addition, it was one side of Roman life that the prouder Roman should not tolerate, and Martial's disapproval is merely superimposed upon this traditional attitude and buttressed by it.

The tale is not much different among the handicraftsmen and those who contracted for their services. We are still in the realm of slave and freedman. What an outrage, exclaims the poet, this kissing craze has become at Rome! You are bussed on one side by the weaver (*textor*), on the other by the fuller (*fullo*), and again by the cobbler (*sutor*) who has just been kissing his hide (xii, 59). What could be more disgusting? Yet these same fullers, greedy like the rest (vi, 93, 1), gather in their inordinate gains and, at least in the case of one of their number, can entertain their native municipalities with gladiatorial shows (iii, 59). The metal-worker (*aerarius*) and the money-lender (*faenerator*) are among those who rob Rome of its matutinal slumbers and so, of course, could never rise at all in Martial's esteem (xii, 57, 6f). These money-lenders were loathsome creatures anyway to a man like Martial, who was in a continual state of insolvency and would rather receive a *gift* of money than put up surety for a loan. Sextus, one of these fellows, at the approach of our poet, murmurs to himself very audibly that he hasn't a cent (*quadrans nullus*) in his chest. "Vile worm!" mutters Martial; "it is bad enough to refuse a loan when you are asked, but much worse to do so beforehand" (ii, 44). Cladus, another pawn-broker, advances less than forty cents on a customer's ring (ii, 57). One of Martial's particular banes among this class was Secundus, stern-voiced and without a trace of human benevolence (vii, 92, 3). A contractor (*redemptor*) for construction work is very likely to be an arrant cheat, and a good five-foot rule, says Martial, is a handy weapon to have on hand to combat his fraud (xiv, 92). Even the brazen mule-driver (*mulio*), knowing that his asinine

subjects cannot complain intelligibly about him, will rob them of their barley and sell it to the innkeeper (x, 2, 9f; xiii, 11).

Undertakers' menials (*vispillones*), too, are a tribe to be scorned, being on a par with hangmen (*carnifices*) and neither better nor worse than doctors (i, 30; i, 47; and ii, 61, 3f); and this, as we have seen,⁶ is contempt indeed. Barbers (*tonsores*) are especially exasperating. It is hard to do without them (ii, 48, 2), and yet they goad one almost to the verge of despair. The sidewalk barber, in particular, is a menace to life on this planet (vii, 61, 7). The slashing Antiochus, barber by trade, will disfigure a customer more effectively than any other known agent. Avoid him if you are not yet prepared to meet the god of the lower world. The he-goat of all beasts alone seems to have good sense: he chooses to go bearded in order to escape Antiochus' razor (xi, 84). The barber Eutrapelus (Mr. Skillful), on the other hand, works so slowly and deliberately that another beard has grown by the time he has finished shaving the original one (vii, 83).⁷ Yet one of these worthless fellows, Cinnamus, "the most noted barber in the whole city," has been made a knight through the generosity of a female acquaintance, only to find, as Martial tauntingly observes, that he is, by nature, fitted to be nothing else than a barber (vii, 64; cf. also vi, 64, 26). Martial is here voicing, in his own pungent manner and with his own unique comments, the opinions of his day and generation. For the pursuits which all these men represented met with scant respect from any true-born Roman citizen. They were all out of caste.

Certain trades in particular Martial regarded as especially conducive to ill-deserved gain; and about these, for this reason if for no other, his pen is more fluent than ever. The job of public crier or auctioneer (*praeco*), like that of undertaker (*libitinarius*), was held in general contempt.⁸ So when the auctioneer Gellianus,

⁶ Cf. the CLASSICAL JOURNAL xxiv (1929), 364f.

⁷ Cf. viii, 52, where, however, another interpretation is possible.

⁸ By the terms of the *Lex Iulia Municipalis* (45 B.C.), 94-97, *praecones* and *libitinarii* were excluded from standing for municipal offices; cf. C. G. Bruns, *Fontes Iuris Romani Antiqui*⁷: Tübingen, P. Siebeck (1909), 107; and E. G. Hardy, *Six Roman Laws*: Oxford, Clarendon Press (1911), 155f. Cf. also Cicero, *Ad Familiares* vi, 18, 1.

mentioned by Martial, kissed the slave girl in order to prove her qualities, he immediately lost all chances of making a sale (vi, 66). Yet such vileness did not prevent the trade of auctioneer from being one of the most profitable in the imperial city. Our poet advises a friend, Lupus, to avoid all higher learning for his boy: if he is dull, make him an auctioneer and his fortune is assured (v, 56).⁹ Just so the *praeco* Eulogus (Mr. Plausible) wins the hand of an eligible maiden in the face of competition from two praetors, four tribunes, seven lawyers, and ten poets; and Martial is quite cynically convinced that the old father has done wisely and well by his daughter (vi, 8).¹⁰ Cobblers (*sutores*) seem to have furnished another special butt for Martial's disesteem. He abominates their kisses as he would those of a viper (xii, 59). In three epigrams (iii, 16, 59, and 99) he applies to a cobbler the term *cerdo*, which was used for slaves or tradesmen of the lowest class. Such creatures are outcast; but this fact does not hinder them in the accumulation of wordly treasure. Here is one who has become possessed of the estate of his deceased patron. "My parents taught me letters," bitterly exclaims the poet; "but what is the use to me of teachers of grammar and of rhetoric if a shoe can give a cobbler a gift like that?" (ix, 73). Another cobbler, like his mate the fuller, is affluent enough to spend his surplus on a gladiatorial show for his home town (iii, 16 and 59), and Martial is rather fiendishly amused when he has got the fellow angry by twitting him about it (iii, 99).

Charioteers (*aurigae*) are another low-lived lot which the public honors with both praise and wealth. Here we can well imagine that it is the real Martial himself who is speaking. One Catianus is rogue enough to "pull" his team in a race, probably in order to gratify some patron who has staked his money on a different color (vi, 46). Yet in polite conversation his fellows Scorpis and Incitatus will take precedence over topics of art and literature (xi, 1, 15f), just as Messrs. Ruth and Tunney, in our own sporting circles, have little competition from Barrie or Shaw.

⁹ Cf. Petronius, *Satiricon* xlvi, 7.

¹⁰ Cf. Juvenal vii, 5f, where poets are forced to turn *praecones* in order to make a living.

Scorpus, when victorious, carries off in a single hour fifteen bags of gold, whereas the client Martial spends a whole feverish day to receive a few spare pennies (x, 74; cf. also x, 76). In view of this bitterness we are tempted to wonder who paid our poet for writing the lament on Scorpus' death and the eulogistic epitaph that we find in the tenth book of the *Epigrams* (x, 50 and 53). Or may it be, rather, that here we read the sportsman Martial's genuine tribute to the individual, whereas elsewhere we have his stinging scorn for an overprized profession? Musicians, too, were a well-paid tribe — too well paid, of course, for Martial's satisfaction. The same parent whom we have already mentioned is advised to make his boy into a lyre-player (*citharoedus*) or a flute-player (*choraules*) if he shows an aptitude for money-making arts (v, 56). The poet belittles the pride of a certain wealthy Rufinus by reminding him that Philomelus the musician has more than he (III, 31); and he replies to a hypothetical query as to when he will return to Rome from a sojourn in Cisalpine Gaul with the words, *veniet cum citharoedus erit* (III, 4). In spite of their wealth, as well as because of it, these musicians were a bother; and the best entertainment of all, Martial thinks, is one in which there is no lyre-player to din one's ears (ix, 77).

Architecture was another lucrative pursuit at Rome, but it was also generally held in higher esteem than the others already mentioned. Martial is hardly different in his own attitude. While he grieves to note that this calling is highly rewarded while the profession of letters is not (v, 56), he is ready to pay a very flattering tribute to Rabirius, the architect (*architectus*) of Domitian's palace on the Palatine (vii, 56).¹¹ The fact remains, however, that Martial could not view with perfect serenity the professional status of the auctioneer, the cobbler, the charioteer, the musician, and the architect so long as they were paid well and the pursuit of poetry was a career of beggary. This was a perversion of nature that he could never condone.

The charioteer and the musician were not the only professional

¹¹ Of course we cannot be sure that this was not an indirect shaft of flattery aimed at the master through the servant. We must always, in reading Martial, be wary of such commendations.

entertainers that our poet disliked. He spurned them all; and we can imagine that here, too, he was sustained in his position by the best elements of Roman society. Gladiators (*gladiatores*) were, in most cases, slaves, though under the Empire they were, on occasion, even *equites* and senators; and they merited little esteem from any respectable person. Yet, to be sure, many of them were idolized, like our own athletic heroes. Martial himself pays a tribute to the fighter Hermes (*et gladiator et magister*) in a peculiar poem of fifteen lines, every one of which begins with the idol's name (v, 24).

The gladiatorial trainers (*lanistae*) were by general consent little more than brutes, so that Martial was probably echoing sentiment in using the name of this occupation, along with other obviously vile terms, as an epithet to apply to a certain Vacerra whom he despised. Even here the poet cannot refrain from inveighing against riches in his customary manner. "I wonder, Vacerra," he concludes, "why you are not wealthy!" (xi, 66). The boxing master (*magister*) with his cauliflower ear (*fracta aure*) was probably not much better (vii, 32, 5). The keeper and trainer of snakes (*custos dominusque viperarum*) and the foul dancing master from Gades were of the lowest rank of disrepute, classed with those petty hucksters whom we have already introduced as stigmatized by Martial as the very dregs of humanity (i, 41).

Of actors (*mimi*)¹² the poet has little of importance to say.¹³ He mentions the *mima* Thymele and the *mimi* Latinus and Panniculus in terms that would suggest that the performances in which they participated were not the highest and purest forms of histrionic art. In fact, the acting profession was, like some others, confined almost entirely to freedmen, foreigners, and slaves; the citizen who performed professionally, at least under the Empire, suffered legal *infamia*, thus being barred from holding public office.¹⁴ Accordingly, the social esteem in which actors as such

¹² Martial nowhere in his epigrams employs the word *histrion*.

¹³ Cf. i, 4, 5; ii, 72, 3f; iii, 86, 3f; v, 61, 11f; ix, 28; and xi, 13. There is a subtle hint in vii, 64, 9.

¹⁴ Cf. Livy vii, 2, 12; Suetonius, *Aug.* xlv, 3f; *Digest* iii, 2, 2, 5; also Tenney Frank, "The Status of Actors at Rome," *Class. Phil.* xxvi (1931), 11-20.

were held could not have been very high,¹⁵ though individual performers were complimented, flattered, and materially rewarded. Martial seems to be paying a high tribute to the famous Latinus in an epigram that is echoed by Ben Jonson's lines on Shakespeare.¹⁶ There the actor, styling himself "the sweet idol of the stage, the glory of the games, the darling of your applause," defends his private life from attack on the grounds of his actions on the stage (ix, 28). So, too, the actor Paris is honored in an epitaph as "the darling of the city and the wit of the Nile, art and grace itself, playfulness and joy, the Roman theater's glory and bereavement, and all the Venuses and Cupids incarnate" (xi, 13).¹⁷

Official position *per se* held no charm for Martial, particularly if the incumbent himself was unworthy. He was pleased enough to commend in verse the tenure of the consulship by his friend Silius Italicus in the year 68 (vii, 63, 9f) and to felicitate him when the same high office fell to one of his sons some twenty-five years later (viii, 66); and he prays earnestly to Apollo, god of bards, that a like honor may be granted to his poet friend Stella (ix, 42). Even under the Empire the consulship was an honorable distinction, though it was not much more. But some holders of public office were worthy of nothing but contempt. Such is the consul who attends "a thousand morning levees (*mane saluator limina mille teras*), crowding out poorer and humbler brethren who find it hard to compete against his official purple for their patron's alms (x, 10). In such cases the rewards are bound to be unequal: the poor client may be asked to dinner, but the consul, by his assiduous lobbying, gains a rich province to plunder (xii, 29). Moreover, courting a praetor or a consul was a burdensome bore, when at any moment of the day he might expect a crowd of

¹⁵ Cf. Seneca, *Epist. Mor.* xlvii, 17; Tacitus, *Ann.* i, 77; Juvenal vii, 90; Suetonius, *Aug.* xlv, 3f; and *Digest* xxiii, 2, 44.

¹⁶ "Th' applause, delight, the wonder of our stage."

¹⁷ *Urbis deliciae salesque Nili,
ars et gratia, lusus et voluptas,
Romani decus et dolor theatri
atque omnes Veneres Cupidinesque.*

clients to escort him home from some function or other (x, 70, 9; cf. also II, 74; and XI, 24). Yet holding high office involved heavy expense, too; and Martial gives a knowing wink to one Proculeia who has divorced her husband, the praetor, at the very beginning of the year, when, as we might say, the bills for his lavish entertainments are about due to arrive (x, 41). After all, these great and mighty magistrates did not rate so high in the scale of wealth, for, as we have already seen, one auctioneer has outbid two praetors, four tribunes, and seven lawyers for the privilege of marrying an old man's daughter (VI, 8). In Domitian's day Martial was safe in taking but a languid interest in politics. Nor was it his rôle, either, to play upon the heavier instruments of war (VIII, 3, 13f). He has little to say in general about military offices, confining his observations to a few personal remarks about hardy centurions¹⁸ with whom he was acquainted and several of whom had fallen on foreign fields while engaged in the service of Rome.¹⁹

Finally, in matters of religion Martial was a Roman.²⁰ He observed the proper forms, but it is highly doubtful that he ever experienced a surge of religious devotion. For the imported cult of Cybele and her emasculated priests (*Galli*) he can entertain only utter disgust (I, 35, 15; v, 41, 3; VII, 95, 15; and IX, 2, 13f). These are simply rascals that practice vice under the guise of religion, and when hungry they are not above selling the brazen cymbals which are used in their crazy rites.²¹ The bald-pated, linen-clad priests of Isis, with their noisy crowd of followers (*linigeri fugiunt calvi sistrataque turba*), were scarcely much better (XII, 28, 19; cf. also IX, 29, 6). Yet, even in Martial's day, there did exist religious devotees who were not rogues and impostors. Such is the Roman Carpus whom the poet praises in one of

¹⁸ Cf. XI, 3, 4 (*rigido centurione*).

¹⁹ Cf. I, 31; VI, 58; XIII, 69 (*Pudens*): I, 93 (Fabricius and Aquinus): and x, 26 (Varus, fallen in Egypt): also VI, 76 (Fuscus, in Dacia).

²⁰ Cf. E. E. Burriess, "Martial and the Religion of His Day," the CLASSICAL JOURNAL, XXI (1926), 679f.

²¹ Cf. XIV, 204 (*Cymbala*). The *esuriens Gallus* of this epigram recalls Juvenal's famous *Graeculus esuriens* (III, 78); the sentiment in both cases is, no doubt, similar — a strong feeling of contempt for easterners.

his laudatory epigrams as a duteous high priest (*pius antistes*) who devotes his gifts to the pursuit of wisdom (vii, 74).²² Thus there was still real worth to be found in the holy profession. The witch or fortune-teller (*saga*) and the astrologer (*astrologus*), we might say in passing, draw from Martial only a few casual remarks (vii, 54, 4; ix, 29, 9; ix, 82, 1; and xi, 49, 8). "Garrulous" he calls the former (xi, 49, 8). Probably his contempt for such charlatanism was too eloquent even for words.

Not all the canvases in Martial's gallery have been passed in review in this survey. But sufficient have been produced to prove the kaleidoscopic quality not only of his literary output but also of the Roman world in which he lived, a world which will stand comparison with our own in many striking particulars. Obviously Martial is one of the most modern of the ancients. But it is to be noted in addition that he is a zealous and exceedingly realistic reporter of many humbler walks of life that the more elevated Roman literature is wont to disregard. For our comprehensive knowledge of these lower levels of society we shall always remain his debtors.

²² In line 7 some MSS read *Caro* or *caro* instead of *Carpo*.

EARLY ROMAN UNDERSTANDING OF CHRISTIANITY

By ERWIN J. URCH
Senior High School
University City, Missouri

It is rather significant that the typical writer on early Christianity gives little or no consideration to contemporary non-Christian views. Though these are few and fragmentary, they represent an understanding of Christianity and its devotees which no historian can afford to ignore. Early Roman writers reveal a lack of historical accuracy through their comments on the new religion. But their brutal frankness indicates how the early Christians impressed some of their contemporaries.

A writer like Tacitus (*Annales* xv, 44) shows both indifference and intolerance in what he has to say about the Christians. Even though he may have faithfully reported actual records of the Neronian persecution, a certain bitterness of his own is revealed in his brief comment and peculiar descriptive phrases. He was an aristocrat, and he wrote at a time when most of the Christians were of the lower classes within the Empire. In the Mediterranean world at that time there were numerous religions in conflict,¹ and Christianity was just beginning its career of world conquest; whereas in the western world today there are simply numerous types of Christians and of Jews, and few people are wholly unrelated to one of these groups. In other words, Tacitus wrote when the Christians were relatively few and Christianity was merely one of several religions within the field of his observation; hence his descriptive phrases seem extraordinary at a time when the general religious situation is so different.

¹ Cf. T. R. Glover, *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire* 2: London, Methuen & Co. (1909).

On the other hand, the genial Pliny the Younger, a contemporary and friend of Tacitus, and also an aristocrat, displayed a notable lack of bitterness toward the Christians. In fact, Pliny seems to be moderately refuting such views as those of Tacitus; cf. *Epistulae ad Traianum* xcvi. The contrast in the opinions of these two men discloses a marked difference in personality and suggests that personal traits play no small part in historical interpretation.

Since both Tacitus and Pliny were public officials at different times in their lives, what they say about Christianity partially explains why the Roman government sought to suppress it.² Torturing and executing Christians became a traditional function of government, especially under the most ambitious and energetic emperors and imperial officers. To acknowledge faith in this unusual religion was to confess a crime worthy of severe punishment. Police officers and courts sought merely to discover whether or not certain persons professed this faith. The worst rumors concerning Christian affairs in general seem to have been the chief "evidence" justifying drastic action. Pliny and Trajan, his master, however, were inclined to make attempts to investigate the actual charges made.

Though Tacitus employs his descriptive terms depicting Christianity only in his account of Nero's persecution, it is fairly certain that he projected back to the earlier period ideas which were current at the time of his writing (about 120 A.D.).³ Christianity was regarded as an evil, and so the imperial government sought to destroy it. Tacitus speaks of Judaea, where this new faith originated, as *originem eius mali*, and of its followers as *per flagitia inuisos* (*Annales* xv, 44, 3-7). These shameful acts were doubtless imaginary. It was believed that magic, infanticide, and

² Cf. E. G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History*²: London, Geo. Allen & Unwin (1910), 41-161, which deals primarily with this question and assembles the important primary and secondary sources; but in assuming that the Romans always justified their treatment of the Christians on any such elaborate and technical basis as Chapters VII and IX of this book represent, the author certainly goes farther than the Romans themselves did.

³ Cf., e.g., Hardy, *op. cit.* 41-59.

incest were practised by the Christians⁴; and the apparent secrecy of their meetings irritated the Romans. Indeed, since the days of the Bacchanalian associations of 186 B.C. (cf. Livy xxxix, 8-19) the Romans were easily inclined to suspect the integrity of any social group which seemed to be secretive. It was not as easy then as now to understand the purpose of Christian assemblies and the harmlessness of Christian doctrines. Hence certain evils as well as secrecy were commonly attributed to the whole movement.

Tacitus classes Christianity with *cuncta . . . atrocia aut pudenda*. Then he minimizes popular support of Nero's charge against the Christians, and at the same time adds another characterization of them by saying that those who acknowledged their religious faith were convicted *haud proinde in crimine incendii quam odio humani generis*. In other words, quite aside from the pretended charge of incendiarism, Tacitus implies, the Christians should have been convicted because it was well known that they hated their fellowmen. In view of the fact that the opposite practice was required by their faith, this *odium humani generis* represents either the failure of Romans to understand fundamental Christian ethics or else the failure of Christians to make their deeds coincide with their precepts — perhaps both. A similar hatred of mankind was attributed to the Jews (cf. Tacitus, *Histories* v, 5, 2), who seem to have shared with the Christians in the Neronian persecution.

Such a notion may have arisen from the fact that these religious bodies tended to isolate themselves and practise fraternalism only within their groups. Jews and Christians failed to participate in social gatherings and popular amusements. Christians were admonished to "hate life in this world," and they talked of "the world" in a way difficult to understand.⁵ They talked also of "the end of this world." A confusion of terms and the other-worldliness of Christian teaching may account for the popular notion

⁴ Cf. Minucius Felix, *Octavius* ix, 2; x, 5; xxviii, 2-5; and Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 7-10.

⁵ Cf. *John* xii, 25; also *Matthew* xiii, 40 and 49; xvi, 26; *Mark* viii, 36; *Luke* ix, 25; *Romans* xii, 2; *I Corinthians* i, 20; ii, 6 and 12; iii, 18f; vii, 31; viii, 4, etc.

that these enthusiasts, who practised their religion so intensively, actually hated their fellowmen.

Such an understanding of Christianity is no more extraordinary than the notion that people who hated mankind should be put to death. Once the precedent was set by Nero, more or less by accident, persecuting Christians soon became a sort of intermittent governmental habit. Finally, in the fourth century, Christianity had so thoroughly penetrated Roman society and its devotees had become so numerous that persecution was no longer a wise policy. Other reasons have been advanced for drastic action against Christians,⁶ but the rumors implied in the vigorous phrases of Tacitus no doubt did most, now and then, to revive the governmental habit which persisted, in spite of long lapses, throughout more than two centuries. Moreover, the teachings and religious gatherings of the Christians, at that early time, seemed so strange that Roman officials believed they were not being told the truth when these were explained to them. Pliny (*op. cit.* xcvi, 7f), however, could see no harm in what occurred in Christian assemblies, but still he thought that those who refused to give up their religion, in response to imperial order, should be punished. The refusal to recognize the omnipotence of the Roman government was the capital offense.

The Christians, however, had a different notion concerning whom they should obey. They asserted that men "ought to obey God rather than men" (*Acts* v, 29). Such obstinacy the Romans could not understand. Usually tolerant of foreign religions, they could not understand people who took their religion as seriously as the Christians did. Had Christianity been a mere practical philosophy like Stoicism, or a nonethical religion like the mystery cults, it probably would not have fared as it did. But since obedience to governmental authority was the first principle of law and order among the Romans, the Christian effort "to obey God rather than men" seemed like rebellion. And so Pliny, otherwise inclined to be lenient, declared that the Christians ought to be punished for their obstinacy.

⁶ Cf. Hardy, *op. cit.* 41-161, which presents all of the generally accepted grounds for the persecutions.

The most serious indictment which Pliny launched against the Christians is contained in his conclusion (*op. cit.* xcvi, 7): *Nihil aliud inveni quam superstitionem pravam, immodicam*. Suetonius (*Nero* xvi), likewise, refers to them as *genus hominum superstitionis novae ac maleficae*. Any foreign cult might be called a *superstitio*. The Roman understanding, or misunderstanding, of Christianity is revealed in the adjectives which these men used. Pliny thinks it is absurd and excessive; Suetonius deems it novel and impious. This understanding of the religion would not have brought on the persecutions. Christians were put to death because disrespect for imperial authority and certain immoral practices seemed to be required by their faith. Moreover, there was a great deal of indefinable passion and irrational unaccountability displayed by Roman officials in their treatment of the Christians. But the tradition that these people were undesirable members of society provided the stimulus to original actions against them.

The personal character of the emperor, or of his representative, often determined the policy concerning the Christians. Domitian, e.g., was extremely suspicious and was fearful lest something might happen to detract from his power and prestige. Emphasis upon emperor-worship increased. Christians refused to recognize imperial divinity. Hence their apparent disloyalty was dealt with as though it were detrimental to the interests of good government. Charges of atheism were brought against prominent persons professing the Christian faith.⁷ Some were put to death, the property of others was confiscated, and a few, including Domitilla, were banished. "Atheism" for these victims was their unwillingness to pay their respects to Domitian as "lord and god."

The Roman rulers understood emperor-worship generally as a political necessity, whereas the Christians viewed it mainly as a possible hindrance to consistency in their religious faith. Mutual misunderstanding, therefore, resulted in occasional campaigns to destroy Christianity. In respect to emperor-worship the rulers thought primarily in political terms; the Christians, in religious

⁷ Cf. Dio LXVII, 14f; Suetonius, *Domitian* x, XIII, and xv; and Eusebius, *Eccles. History* III, 17 and iv, 26.

terms. And yet certain zealots understood the general Roman attitude so well that they knew precisely what to do in order to die as martyrs. Distinguished ecclesiastical writers proudly reported cases of persons who courted martyrdom,⁸ the unnatural desire for which not only increased the number of victims but also strengthened the impression that they were simply resisting the Roman government.

The definitive, though limited, understanding of Christianity recorded by early pagan writers is shown quite as much by the brevity as by the character of their observations. Tacitus says that Christians were despised because of their reputation for despicable behavior. This evil religion was said to have among its votaries people who hated mankind. Pliny the Younger thinks of it as extreme nonsense. And Suetonius calls it an impious novelty. The very brevity of these remarks indicates contempt for Christianity and its devotees. The few brief comments are consistently alike in character and frankness. Hence it is reasonable to suppose that they represent a fairly definite and widespread opinion.

What these comments lack in volume may be supplied by reports of ecclesiastical writers themselves. For example, Minucius Felix, who wrote at least a half century later than the aforementioned pagan writers, undoubtedly expressed current pagan views of Christianity in his dialogue, which was designed to correct those views.⁹ He imitated Cicero, e.g. his *De Natura Deorum*, as well as other Roman authors in his form of presentation.

Minucius' dialogue, or debate, with Octavius Januarius defending Christianity and Caecilius Natalis attacking it, was addressed to skeptics and to the cultured people of the time. The argument dwells on the advantages of following one's ancestors' religion and of worshipping the Roman gods, on the tendency of Christians to be secretive, and on their "crimes" — incest, sacrifice of children, etc. Christians were charged with absurd and impious con-

⁸ Cf. e.g., Ignatius, *Ep. ad Roman.* 4; Justin, *Apol.* II, 2; and Eusebius, *op. cit.* v, 21.

⁹ Cf. *Octavius*, especially IX, 2; X, 5; and XXVIII, 2-5.

ceptions of divinity, of the end of the world, of the resurrection of the dead, and of the hardships of this life. The argument includes few of the political and judicial considerations which occupy so much space in Tertullian. And the argument for Christianity is especially weak, although at the end Caecilius asserts that his opponent had won the debate. Hence, if we allow for exaggerations for the sake of argument, the prevailing pagan understanding of Christianity is fairly well implied, if not portrayed, in this unique document.

One passage (*Octavius* ix, 2) is significant because it implies more than it actually says: *Occultis se notis et insignibus noscunt et amant mutuo . . . inter eos velut quaedam libidinum religio miscetur, ac se promisce appellant fratres et sorores, ut etiam non insolens stuprum intercessionem sacri nominis fiat incestum. ita eorum vana et demens superstitio sceleribus gloriatur*. While the first part of this statement does not seem to confirm Tacitus' notion that Christians hated their fellowmen, the last part offers an absurd explanation why pagans believed them to be guilty of incest as a regular practice.

The injury to Roman pride, inflicted by the refusal of Christians to let imperial commands interfere with their faith, is reflected by a question asked by Caecilius in the course of his argument (*ibid.* xii, 5): *Nonne Romani sine vestro deo imperant per regna, fruuntur orbe toto vestrique dominantur?* This typical Roman boast reveals a disposition which could in no way countenance the tendency among Christians to put religion above politics and so seem disrespectful toward the government. Caecilius argues that Roman power is proof that the pagan worship is best.

The most pertinent portion of the defense of Christianity includes both an acknowledgment of previous notions about the movement and also a complaint against those who still held such notions (*ibid.* xxviii, 2): *Et nos enim idem fecimus et eadem vobiscum quondam adhuc caeci et hebetes sentiebamus, quasi Christiani monstra colerent, infantes vorarent, convivia incesta miscerent; nec intellegebamus, fabulis ista semper ventilari et*

numquam vel investigari vel probari . . . Besides mentioning again some of the "abominations" for which, as Tacitus says, Christians were "despised," this passage launches a just complaint that these things were believed even though no serious efforts to prove them had been made.

Roman prosecutors seldom sought to ascertain the truth or falsity of the sinister notions about the Christians. The truth of **these** notions was taken for granted, very much like a common tradition. Suspected persons were forced merely to confess or deny the Christian faith, as though the pagan prejudice against them was proof that they were criminals. But the friction between them and the government was due not so much to this prejudice as to the mutual misunderstanding over the relative importance of political obedience and religious fidelity.

THE GENERAL SPEAKS — A COMPARISON OF GREEK AND ROMAN METHODS OF LEADERSHIP¹

By DOROTHY M. ROEHM
Thomas M. Cooley High School
Detroit, Michigan

Our responsibility as teachers of Latin and Greek may well begin with forms and syntax, but it does not end there. It rests with us to introduce the Romans and Greeks in person to our pupils. Frequently we are heard to criticize the lack of background of our pupils; but if rightly viewed, this very need should be a greater challenge to us. For who can teach ancient history, literature, and art better than the teacher of the Latin and Greek languages? And who is better qualified to interpret the characteristics of those two nations than we who know the classical authors?

The purpose of this paper is to suggest the use of certain familiar passages as a means of interpreting the character of the Romans, and of contrasting the genius of the Romans and the Greeks. The passages are selected from Caesar and Xenophon, since a greater proportion of pupils read the works of Caesar than those of Cicero and Vergil. Obviously the works of Cicero and Vergil present abundant material for portraying the Romans and Greeks, but too many pupils miss the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with the great orator and the greater poet; so the teacher must be content to introduce the Romans through the statesman and the military man.

Enter the general and let him speak for himself. Dull, indeed,

¹ Read before the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club in Ann Arbor on May 1, 1931.

is that class which fails to catch the spirit of the Roman in Caesar's words in *De Bello Gallico* I, 40:

He rebuked the centurions harshly, first because they thought it necessary to inquire or consider into what direction or with what plan they were being led. In his own consulship, he said, Ariovistus very eagerly had sought the friendship of the Roman people. Why should anyone think he would withdraw so rashly from his obligation? Caesar, at least, was persuaded that, when his demands were made known and the fairness of his conditions realized, Ariovistus would reject neither his own favor nor that of the Roman people. But if, impelled by rage and madness, Ariovistus should make war upon them, what, pray, had they to fear? Or why should they despair of their own courage or of his care? Trial of this enemy was made, he said, in the time of our forefathers, when in the defeat of the Cimbrians and Teutons by C. Marius, the army seemed deserving of no less praise than the general himself; trial was made recently in Italy, in the uprising of the slaves, who were aided considerably by the training and discipline which they had received from us. From this, he said, it could be seen how great advantage there was in steadfast courage, because they had overcome these men, armed and victorious, whom unarmed they had feared without cause a long time.

Those who assigned their fear to a pretended concern about the grain supply and the narrow roads, were acting presumptuously, since they seemed to have little faith in the sense of duty of the general; or else they appeared to be giving him directions in the exercise of it. He said that these matters were his concern: the Sequani, Leuci, Lingones were supplying grain, and the crops were already ripe in the fields; they themselves would judge of the route in a short time.

As to the fact that it is said that the soldiers will not obey his command and will not advance, he says that he is not at all perturbed by this, for he knows that whatever generals an army did not obey, either fortune failed in some unsuccessful campaign, or a charge of avarice was brought against them, after some crime was discovered. His own integrity was known throughout his life, his good fortune in the war with the Helvetians.

When this material is before the class, a picture of a typical Roman may be created in the imagination of the pupils. First of all, there is the Roman sense of authority, which the passage stresses. Caesar's first rebuke is that anyone should question his authority or express any doubt regarding the exercise of it. He repeats the idea in *facere arroganter, cum aut de officio imperatoris desperare aut praescribere viderentur*. And the curt *haec sibi*

esse curae expresses, as nothing else could, the general's attitude toward the unquestioning obedience of his men.

Professor Showerman² says that "the foundations of Roman greatness were laid in authority: in obedience of son to father, of clansman to chief, of subject to king." What better introduction to this fundamental trait of Roman character could be found than in the passage from Caesar? And Dr. McCartney points out "that the very language of the Romans reflects their martial character. Quintilian harps upon the fact that Caesar spoke in the same manner that he fought. His diction was that of a military man. The organization of an involved Latin sentence, with its respect for rank and superiority, is military in character."

To resume the portrait of the Roman citizen, as presented in Chapter 40. *Constantia* (steadfastness) is clearly painted in *ex quo iudicari posse, quantum haberet in se boni constantia*, a sentence which is applicable to all fields of activity. Roman history provides numerous examples of this quality for further illustration.

Aequitate condicionum is expressive of the Roman's sense of justice and fair-dealing and leads easily to a discussion of his relations with his allies and friends.

Caesar strengthens the morale of his soldiers by recalling the war with the Cimbrians and Teutons, and the uprising of the slaves more recently. In this instance he sought to inspire self-confidence in his men by referring to the successes of former soldiers; but pride in the achievements of the past is an essential characteristic of the Romans, and similar references abound in Latin authors. This allusion, then, may serve to present that phase of the typical Roman.

Fortunam defuisse is a perfect introduction to a discussion of Roman religion. In fact *suam innocentiam perpetua vita, felicitatem Helvetiorum bello esse perspectam* might sum up the Roman philosophy of life: integrity and good luck.

You have noted that I am reading more into these lines than

² Cf. Grant Showerman, *Eternal Rome*: New Haven, Yale University Press (1925), 62; and Eugene S. McCartney, *Warfare by Land and Sea*: Boston, Marshall Jones Co. (1923), 90.

Caesar meant to put there, but I think my purpose justifies the procedure. In order to understand the full import of such words as *aequitas*, *virtus*, *diligentia*, *usu ac disciplina*, *constantia*, *fortuna*, *innocentia*, *felicitas*, as they fall from Caesar's lips, the pupils must see in imagination the typical Roman citizen. With the help of the teacher, who draws upon his own resources to make the picture complete, the pupils will feel that they come into personal contact with Caesar and the Romans.

If insistence upon obedience to command needs further illustration, the following passage from VII, 52 (Edwards' translation) may be used:

On the morrow Caesar called a parade and reprimanded the troops for their recklessness and headstrong passion; they had decided for themselves whither they should advance, or what they should do. They had not halted when the signal for retirement was given, and had not been amenable to the restraint of tribunes and lieutenant-generals. He showed what might be the effect of unfavorable ground, which he himself had borne in mind at Avaricum, when, though he had caught the enemy without general and without cavalry, he had given up an assured victory in order that even slight loss in action might not be caused by unfavorable ground. Greatly as he admired the high courage of men whom no camp fortifications, no mountain-height, no town-wall had been able to check, he blamed as greatly their lack of discipline and presumption in supposing that they had a truer instinct than the commander-in-chief for victory and the final result. He required from his soldiers, he said, discipline and self-restraint, no less than valour and high courage.

Thus the Roman general speaks. And now the scene shifts to Asia Minor, and time is turned back three and a half centuries. What the Roman general did by command, the Greek general accomplished by persuasion. Or, as McCartney phrases it: "Results that the Greeks achieved by inspiration, the Romans gained by labored efforts."

It has always seemed to me that Greek independence and individualism could be shown no more effectively than by contrasting Caesar's management of the critical situation in I, 40 with Clearchus' appeal to his soldiers in the *Anabasis* I, 3, 3-6. True, the Greek forces were mercenary troops and had no patriotic

interest in the success of Cyrus' campaign. In some respects the situations are not exactly parallel, but none the less the Greek nature stands forth clearly delineated.

You will recall the situation. The Greek troops had enlisted in Cyrus' campaign against his brother, without being informed of the true purpose of the expedition. When they realized that they were marching against the king of Persia, they rebelled. To quote :

The soldiers said that they would not advance. For they now suspected that they were going against the king. And they said that they had not been hired for this purpose. At first, Clearchus tried to compel his own soldiers to go. They threw missiles at him and the baggage, when they began to advance. Clearchus then narrowly escaped being stoned to death; and later, when he knew that he would not be able to force them, he called an assembly of his own soldiers. And first he stood weeping before them a long time. And they were moved at the sight and were silent. Then he spoke as follows: "Fellow-soldiers, do not be surprised that I am greatly troubled by the present situation. For Cyrus was my guest-friend, and he gave me ten thousand darics, besides honoring me, a fugitive from my native land, in other respects. I took this money and spent it not for my own pleasure, but for you. . . . And when Cyrus summoned me, I took you and went to him, that I might aid him in any way he wanted, in return for the favors I had received from him. Since you are not willing to accompany me, then either I must give *you* up and enjoy the friendship of Cyrus, or fail him and remain with you. I do not know whether I am doing what is right, but at any rate, I shall choose you, and with you I shall suffer whatever is necessary. And no one shall ever say that I, after leading Greeks against the Persians, betrayed the Greeks and chose the friendship of the Persians. But since you are not willing to obey me, I shall follow you and shall suffer whatever is necessary. For I consider that you are both fatherland and friend and ally to me, and with you I think I should be worthy wherever I might be, but without you I should be able neither to aid a friend nor to ward off an enemy. Accordingly, be assured that I shall go wherever you go."

The effect of this speech is heightened by clever acting. When more than two thousand soldiers, belonging to Xenias and Pasion, joined Clearchus' forces at this point, Cyrus summoned Clearchus to learn the reason. Clearchus publicly refused to go

in order to maintain his pose before his soldiers, but privately sent word to Cyrus that everything would be taken care of, and requested Cyrus to repeat the summons.

Then follows another speech to the soldiers, in which Clearchus sums up their relation to Cyrus: "For we are no longer his soldiers, since we do not follow him, nor is he our paymaster"—a clever thrust! Proceeding on the assumption that they are deserting Cyrus, Clearchus describes the situation which they have created by their independent attitude, and shrewdly brings out the absurdity of such a plan. Without Cyrus they will have no food, no protection, no guides, and no money; Cyrus, on the contrary, has infantry, cavalry, and naval forces, and to his enemies he can be the bitterest foe. At the conclusion of his speech, he invites others to express their opinions. Among those who did so were some who had been coached previously in their parts. Clearchus seems to have overlooked nothing in his show! It was suggested by one soldier that other generals be chosen, if Clearchus did not wish to serve; that Cyrus be asked for boats, or, if he refused that request, that he be asked for a leader to guide them home, who should make the natives friendly to them as they advanced. If they were refused a leader, then they should fight their own way back as well as they could. Clearchus interrupts to say that he would willingly follow another leader. (Would Caesar have promised as much, even for the sake of an argument? Roman imagination could not compass such tactics!)

At this point in the play another actor shows the inconsistency of asking Cyrus for boats or a guide, when they are deserting him; and he then presents his plan as a solution of their difficulties. He suggests that they ask Cyrus the true purpose of the campaign and decide their course of action accordingly. An embassy was sent to Cyrus, and finally more pay was promised the soldiers, although they were not yet informed of their destination. However, they decided to advance in spite of their suspicions.

The passage shows the Greeks' love of independence of thought and action. According to the description of his character, given

in II, 6, 8f, the Spartan Clearchus liked good discipline and always maintained it among his soldiers; yet, in this instance, even he could not secure it by force. But "when Greek meets Greek," ingenuity prevails. The very fact that Clearchus found it necessary to appeal to the emotions of his men is significant; it is discipline through drama. His method of gaining their attention by tears is a commentary on the Greek temperament. We cannot imagine Caesar reduced to the necessity of devising and staging a play to win the support of his soldiers. Yet Clearchus presents his own plan to the army through this skillfully managed farce. However, it is to be noted that the arguments are presented with a show of reasoning, for the Greek must be convinced through his reason, even though he must be approached through his feelings.

Thus, the pupils see how the imagination of the Greek general devised a plan to gain the desired end. Using this example of strategy as an illustration of the imaginative power of the Greeks, we can easily show how this quality, given complete freedom of expression, produced the great thinkers and creative artists of Greece.

Finally, the two generals, Caesar and Clearchus, as spokesmen for their respective nations, may express the essential differences between the Romans and the Greeks and make each nation assume in the pupils' imagination a distinct and vivid personality. They make it apparent why the Romans with their love of order and respect for authority gave law to the world as their chief contribution, while the highly developed individualism of the Greeks found its expression in the greatest art and literature the world has ever known.

CONFLAGRATIONS IN ANCIENT ROME

By H. V. CANTER
University of Illinois

In reading the Roman historians one comes upon numerous references to fires and losses by fire in ancient Rome,¹ not only such as are to be expected in the ordinary course of an ancient city's life but conflagrations of very serious consequences, which devastated great areas and involved the partial or total loss of houses, tenements, markets, granaries, storehouses, and splendid public buildings. That fires should have been frequent, indeed of daily occurrence, in ancient Rome, with its narrow, winding alleys and streets, with its closely set, unsubstantial houses and tenements constructed in large part of easily inflammable materials, and without sufficient facilities for promptly checking an outbreak of fire or for successfully combating it once under way, is easily understood. But when we read of fires that wiped out great public structures, these often built throughout of supposedly durable materials and ornamented not less durably with marble and bronze (hence seemingly not an easy prey to flames), in particular when we stand today before their ruins, great masses of con-

¹ The most important secondary sources are: H. Jordan, *Topographie der Stadt Rom im Altertum*: Berlin, Weidmann (1871-1907); Otto Gilbert, *Geschichte und Topographie der Stadt Rom im Altertum*: Leipzig, Teubner (1890); Paul O. Werner, *De Incendiis Urbis Romae Aetate Imperatorum*: Leipzig, Robert Nork (1906); P. K. B. Reynolds, *The Vigiles of Imperial Rome*: London, Humphrey Milford (1926); S. B. Platner, *Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome*: Boston, Allyn and Bacon (1911); Platner-Ashby, *Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*: New York, Oxford University Press (1929); Grant Showerman, *Eternal Rome*: New Haven, Yale University Press (2 vols., 1924); R. Lanciani, *Ancient Rome*: Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Co. (1892); R. Lanciani, *Destruction of Ancient Rome*: New York, Macmillan and Co. (1899); R. Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*: Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Co. (1897); R. Lanciani, *New Tales of Old Rome*: Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Co. (1901); R. Lanciani, *Ancient and Modern Rome*: Boston, Marshall Jones Co. (1925).

crete, brick, and stone that seem to defy even time itself, we are tempted to reject not only positive information to that effect but even the idea that fire could seriously damage (much less destroy) such buildings. Yet the fact remains that Rome suffered again and again from conflagrations that did either consume or ruin them and laid in ashes entire districts of the city. Fire as a destroying agent was in fact far more potent in Rome than the dismantling and disintegrating forces of time and the elements, than the barbarity and wanton violence of man. Indeed it may well be doubted whether any city has ever been so often and so thoroughly devastated by fire as was ancient Rome.

We shall return to the matter of this city's narrow streets, to the kind and height of its buildings and their close proximity, to the building materials used and to the city's storage and warehouse conditions, all of which were factors in making risk there by fire an extra-hazardous one. Meanwhile consideration will be given to Rome's more serious conflagrations and their results, to those about which our sources give information, which is usually definite and is believed to be trustworthy. During the Republic we come first to the destructive fire following the capture of Rome by the Gauls in 390. To this the Romans themselves, as they looked back, attached great importance, as they did also to the staggering catastrophe by fire in Nero's reign. Each of these conflagrations was said (but with considerable exaggeration) to have wholly destroyed an old Rome and to have been followed by the construction of a completely new one. But we know that the city was not completely destroyed. Of course many of the houses, which in 390 B.C. were small and built of wood or mud and osier, and with thatched roofs, were burned. The Roman Forum and the Comitium were laid waste, the porticoes and shops bordering the Forum were burned, many of the early monuments situated in the Forum perished, and the pontifical records, together with precious documents recorded on bronze and stone, were also for the most part destroyed.

In the Gallic conflagration destruction overtook the original hut of wattles built by Numa as a shrine for the sacred fire

watched by the Vestal Virgins. Its successor, the temple of Vesta, was destroyed by fire in 241, when Caecilius Metellus, the high priest, rescued at the cost of his sight (Pliny, *Historia Naturalis* vii, 141; Valerius Maximus i, 4, 5) the Palladium said to have been brought by Aeneas from Troy. In 213 a disastrous fire raged unrestrained for two nights and a day, burning everything to the ground between the *Salinae* (warehouses for salt situated between the Aventine and the Tiber) and the Carmental gate (at the southwest corner of the Capitoline), and extending its destructive path northerly to the edge of the Forum. Thus this fire swept the entire region of the Forum Boarium (cattle market); it also destroyed the temple of Spes in the Forum Holitorium (the vegetable market between the Capitoline and the Tiber), and the still more venerable temples of Fortuna and Mater Matuta, both ascribed by tradition to Servius Tullius.

Three years later, in 210, a great conflagration raged on the north and south sides of the Forum. By it the shops and many private houses around the Forum, the fish market (behind the shops and north of the Forum), the buildings of the *Lautumiae* (a stone-quarry district on the east slope of the Capitoline), and the residence of the high priest (*atrium regium*) were reduced to ashes, while the temple of Vesta was saved with difficulty by the courageous exertions of thirteen slaves. Another extensive fire occurred in 203, when the houses of the thickly built up *Clivus Publicius* were burned to the ground, a street which began at the west end of the Circus Maximus and extended in a southerly direction across the Aventine. In 192 the congested area of the Forum Boarium was again burned over. This fire, attended with the loss of many lives, lasted for a day and a night, during which all the buildings along the Tiber were ablaze and numerous storehouses with their valuable merchandise were reduced to smoldering ruins.

A temple to Venus, which stood somewhere near the Forum, was totally destroyed by fire in 178. A like fate is known to have overtaken the Regia in 148, although details are wanting. The famous temple of Magna Mater, erected on the Palatine some

time after 204 when the Romans introduced her worship from Asia Minor, was burned in 111. In 83, during the wars between Marius and Sulla, the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was burned to its foundations. Civil strife was again responsible for a destructive fire in 52, when the partisans of the notorious Clodius carried his body to the Comitium and burned it on a funeral pyre, for which the seats and benches of senators and judges supplied abundant material. The flames enveloped the Curia Hostilia (the original senate house, but restored and enlarged by Sulla), which was entirely consumed, and also destroyed the Basilica Porcia (the first of its type in Rome, built by M. Porcius Cato in 184), probably totally, since it is not later mentioned. Finally, we come to the last two fires of importance during the time of the Republic; one occurred in 49, when the temple of Quirinus (on the Quirinal) was struck by lightning and much injured if not wholly destroyed, and the other in 36, when the Regia was a second time a prey to flames.

During the period under discussion there are reliable records of fifteen fires, of which seven were widespread conflagrations, while seven others involved the certain loss of at least one important public building. Remembering that our sources are limited, particularly for the early part of the period, and that ancient writers almost invariably confine their accounts of fires to those involving only the more important structures, we may safely conclude that the figures given fall well below the actual occurrences of fires which were considerable in extent and of serious consequences. Those noted were confined practically to two limited areas, the congested industrial and commercial quarter along the Tiber and the district immediately surrounding the Forum.

As we shall see, the great fires of the Empire had in general like causes; and they too were most frequent in particular quarters of the city, the Circus Maximus, the Roman Forum, the Sacra Via, and the Campus Martius, precisely those parts of the city where the hazard of fires was at a maximum. Authentic sources for the last half of the Empire are scanty, and doubtless many

important fires occurred of which no information has come down to us. Even so, we can say that in the imperial period destructive fires in Rome were far more numerous than in that of the Republic. This was due to the fact that a greatly increased population, larger supplies of food and clothing necessary for its maintenance, and an inevitable increase in homes, tenements, shops, and warehouses necessary for domestic and business life, produced still greater congestion in certain already overpopulated quarters, a condition which, as affecting fire risk, was not adequately offset by improved building, either in plans or materials used, or by facilities sufficient for checking and extinguishing fires.

At the very beginning of Augustus' reign (within which period there were nine fires), in the year 31, Rome was swept by an angry fire caused, it was believed, by freedmen as a riotous protest against a tax assessment of one-eighth of their property in excess of a certain sum. It broke out in the Circus Maximus, consumed a great portion of this structure, the temple of Ceres (on the adjoining Aventine), the temple of Spes, and a large number of other buildings. In the destruction of the temple of Ceres there were lost the bronze statues of Ceres, Liber, and Libera, as well as most of the other precious works of sculptors and painters with which the building was adorned. There is little doubt that the whole of the Forum Holitorium was destroyed, including the temple of Janus in this forum, built by the naval hero C. Duilius after his victory over the Carthaginians at Mylae in 260. At least three other devastating fires occurred under Augustus' rule. That of the year 14, in the Forum, burned the Basilica Aemilia, from which the flames spread to the temple of Vesta. This conflagration, it is thought, destroyed also the temple of Castor (wholly rebuilt by Tiberius) and the Basilica Julia, which was rebuilt in an enlarged form by Augustus and rededicated in the names of his grandsons, Gaius and Lucius Caesar. In 12 B.C. we hear of another disaster by fire (the exact location is not known) when many buildings of the city were laid in ruins, among them the famous hut of Romulus. Probably these buildings lay in the main on the north side of the Palatine near the

Forum, since we have a statement that preceding the year 7 B.C. many structures around the Forum had been burned. The fire of A.D. 6 is said to have destroyed much of the city, but it also is indefinite as to location. But that it was disastrous is evident from the fact that Augustus immediately reorganized the combined police and fire service performed by the *vigiles* or night watchmen (see below).

Five fires are recorded for the reign of Tiberius, of which two deserve special mention. One of extraordinary fury in the year 27 ravaged the entire Caelian hill, thickly covered with palaces, houses, and high tenement buildings. Temples on this hill were not numerous, and if any were destroyed there is no mention of that fact. But the damage to private property was so serious that Tiberius made good the losses of owners of blocks of houses. Another fire, in 36, burned the long side of the Circus Maximus facing the Aventine and then spread to the Aventine itself. Some idea of the magnitude of this disaster may be gained from the fact that also to these sufferers Tiberius contributed liberally, donating the large sum of one hundred million sesterces.

One conflagration of major proportions marks the time of Claudius. In 54 the Aemiliana district (in the southern part of the Campus Martius) was leveled by a stubborn fire which lasted for at least a day and two nights. The emperor, when the regular firemen augmented by a body of his own slaves were unable to cope with the flames, summoned the common people from all parts of the city to assist the fire fighters, and paid on the spot each helper so enlisted a suitable remuneration for his service. In this same conflagration was burned (and apparently never rebuilt) the temple of Felicitas, in or near the Forum Boarium. It was in front of this temple, embellished with statues of the Muses by Praxiteles and by other works of art, that Julius Caesar had the misfortune to break the axle of his chariot when celebrating his triumph in 46 B.C.

There is an enormous literature covering various and much disputed aspects of the terrible conflagration of Nero's reign, which took place in the year 64. Suffice it to say that in extent

and destructiveness it is to be numbered among the great conflagrations of history and that it continued at least through six days and seven nights. This fire, beginning at the east end of the Circus Maximus, devastated the whole of the Circus valley, the Forum Boarium, and the Velabrum (low ground between the northwest side of the Palatine and the Capitoline), and in its course swept bare the slopes of the Caelian, Aventine, Capitoline, and Palatine hills. Crossing the Velia the flames reached the Esquiline, where their fury was stayed by the demolition of great masses of buildings, only to break out in the Campus Martius. Of the fourteen regions of the city this conflagration spared only that centering in the Forum (although just east of the Forum the Regia, the temple of Vesta, and the house of the Vestals were badly damaged) and four outlying ones. Three districts were totally destroyed and the remaining six more or less badly injured. There is doubtless exaggeration in the statement that nothing of these remained save a few fragments of half-burned houses, as there certainly is in the assertion that four thousand *insulae* were consumed. Information is lacking as to all the historic monuments that perished, although it is certain that they were many and that they included some of the oldest and most sacred. There is no doubt also that numberless masterpieces of Greek art were destroyed, whose loss was ever a source of lament, although a more splendid city arose above the ruins of the old one.

Under the Emperor Titus Rome was subjected to a violent conflagration, second in importance only to that just described. In the year 80 flames raged for three days and nights, burned a large section of the Campus Martius, and, moving thence in a southeasterly direction, devastated the Capitoline hill. Dio Cassius (LXVI, 24), after naming eleven structures that were consumed (including the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus with its surrounding temples), adds: "Anyone can estimate from the list of buildings that I have given how many others must have been destroyed." It is probable that at least five additional important public buildings were in whole or part destroyed by this same fire. Naturally, too, a large number of public and private buildings of

secondary importance wedged in among the principal ones were swept away at this time.

There were two disasters by fire in the time of Commodus. The first came in 189 when the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, set on fire by lightning, was at least partially burned, as was also the Capitoline library, of which, however, nothing further is known than that it perished at this time. The other fire, in 191, was a frightful conflagration that broke out at night in a private dwelling near the temple of Peace (in the center of the Forum Pacis, north of the Basilica Aemilia), destroyed this temple, devastated the near-by temple of Sacra Urbs, and consumed the *horrea piperrataria* (warehouses filled with costly spices), standing on or near the Sacra Via, where later arose the huge Constantine basilica. The flames in crossing the Velia to the Palatine destroyed almost entirely the temple of Vesta, and severely damaged the house of the Vestals, from which the sacred attendants fled to the Palatine, taking with them the Palladium, then probably for the first time seen by profane eyes. But this was not all. The flames, borne aloft to the Palatine, burned the library established by Augustus in the temple of Apollo, the most magnificent of Augustus' buildings. The imperial palace also was in great part consumed, with the loss of nearly all state records.

The reign of Carinus also is marked by two important fires, both of the year 283. One burned the theater of Pompey (the first permanent structure of its kind in Rome), following three other disasters to it by fire, in A.D. 21, 80, and 247. It also destroyed the adjoining portico of Pompey (intended to protect spectators in case of rain), an exedra within which constituted the curia of Pompey, where, "even at the foot of Pompey's statue, which all the while ran blood, great Caesar fell." The other fire of the year 283 was of much greater violence and extent. It raged from one end of the Sacra Via to the other, devastated the Forum Julium, and destroyed wholly or partially seven, perhaps a greater number, of the city's great public monuments.

The period of the Empire embraced in this discussion begins in 31 B.C. with the sole rule of Augustus and extends to about A.D.

425. No account is taken of lesser fires, to which there are references here and there,² but ample illustration has been given of Rome's great fires, of their frequency, and of their appallingly destructive character. Even so, this by no means tells the whole story. Reckoning only fires of major importance, and of these only such as rest on indubitable authority, the total number is forty-four. In four instances no details are at hand as to the exact location of the fire. Of the fourteen regions into which Augustus divided Rome in 7 B.C., only Regio I (Porta Capena) and Regio XIV (Trans Tiberim) are unrepresented; there is one occurrence each in V (Esquiliae) and VII (Via Lata, name of the southern end of the Via Flaminia); two each in III (Isis et Serapis, the Colosseum valley, and southern spur of the Esquiline), VI (Alta Semita, named for a street crossing the Quirinal), XII (Piscina Publica, so named from a pool near the baths of Caracalla), and XIII (Aventinus); three in II (Caelimontium) and XI (Circus Maximus); four in IV (Templum Pacis); eight in X (Palatium); nine in IX (Circus Flaminius, including the Campus Martius); and fourteen in VIII (Forum Romanum, with the imperial fora and the Capitoline).

The suffering of individual buildings from fire is a good indication of the fate that overtook buildings in general from this devastating agency. From Rome's early period down to the late

² That these small occasional fires involving single houses and tenements were a constant peril incident to life in the Subura and other thickly settled areas is plain from Juvenal's general reference to them (III, 7), *horrere incendia*, and from his vivid description of such a fire (III, 197-202). Moreover, fires on this scale were frequent enough and unexpected enough to create at times the suspicion that the owners themselves of houses burned had applied the torch (Martial III, 52). Fire insurance companies were unknown to the Romans, but both Martial (*loc. cit.*) and Juvenal (III, 212-22) make the point that such substantial contributions of money and other valuables were made to the losers by friends and clients that a fire was a bit of good fortune rather than a loss, especially (as the Juvenal passage tells us) in case the owner was wealthy. From Plutarch (*Crassus* II) we learn that in an earlier period (that of Sulla) the burning of private buildings in Rome was a frequent occurrence, so much so that Marcus Crassus became wealthy by buying at a small sum houses that were afire and then salvaging them with aid of hundreds of slaves whom he had organized for this purpose.

Empire fire was responsible for the destruction, wholly or partially, of the temple of Vesta five times; the Regia and the theater of Pompey at least four times; the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, the Basilica Julia, and the Basilica Aemilia thrice; the theater of Marcellus, the Pantheon, and the Colosseum twice. On the other hand, the picture of havoc wrought by fire through the centuries of Rome's history has its other side. Fires have given in all ages the incentive and the opportunity for rebuilding on a better scale. The great conflagrations which swept over Rome led to its gradual improvement from both a sanitary and an aesthetic point of view. Following the Gallic fire the city sprang up again in every way better than before. The irregular, apparently haphazard, plan of later Rome, with little or no consideration for straight lines or open space between buildings, was even in antiquity ascribed to the haste with which the city had been rebuilt after its destruction in the Gallic disaster. But the irregular reconstruction of the city, with its overcrowded areas, was dependent upon the nature of the terrain and the conditions of settlement rather than upon careless and hasty rebuilding. The fire of 210 led to the erection of magnificent new buildings in the Forum, although it was not possible to do much in the way of reconstruction until after the close of the second Punic war in 201. Another opportunity to rebuild most of the Forum came to the dictator Sulla after the fire of 83. The celebrated boast of Augustus that he had left Rome a city of marble was made possible and relatively true by the repeated purification by fire of a city that was congested, crude, tumbling down, and covered with structures built largely of inflammable materials. The conflagration of Claudius' reign changed the character of the Caelian hill from that of a tenement district to one covered principally by the palaces of the wealthy, with their beautiful gardens and attractive surroundings. After the fire of Nero's reign (persistent tradition ascribed its origin to Nero, that he might carry out ambitious building plans), streets were widened and levels were raised, limitations were set to wooden buildings and to the number of their stories. The Flavian emperors in many ways made an

enviable record as builders. The passion of Domitian and his successors for building, following the fire of Titus' reign, found in the south and middle parts of the Campus Martius a rich field for its activity, which set their contemporaries and later generations in wonder and amazement. No better illustration of the importance of fires as affecting the architectural history of Rome under the emperors can be cited than in the changes in the Forum caused by this means. Four times within the period from Nero to Diocletian this center of the city was laid waste by flames and was as many times rebuilt with structures changed in varying degrees both in plan and in orientation.

The immediate cause of some of the destructive fires in Rome (e.g. those of A.D. 80 and 283) was never ascertainable, as is not infrequently true in the case of fires in large cities today. Doubtless, however, they were mostly due to sheer accident or to the incautious handling of fire in domestic uses and in small manufacturing plants. The Gauls, of course, deliberately set fire to the city following its capture. Occasionally fires were an accompaniment of civil strife, as in 52 B.C. between the forces of Clodius and Milo, or in A.D. 69 when the followers of Vitellius burned the temple of Capitoline Jupiter, or again in 237 when a struggle between the people and the praetorians became so violent that a considerable section of the city was leveled to the ground. To some extent Rome was the victim of deliberate devastation by fire when it was captured by Alaric in 410, as it was also more than six centuries later when at the mercy of Robert Guiscard.

Incidental reference has already been made to fires affecting private property, which were believed to have been the work of an incendiary. To ten fires of greater or lesser importance (no attempt has been made to obtain a complete list) the historians ascribe such an origin. The most famous case is that of Nero's reign, about which much has been written but with little certainty withal as to conclusions. The words of Tacitus (*Annales* xv, 38, 1) are just as true in our day as they were in his: *Clades, forte an dolo principis incertum, nam utrumque auctores prodidere*.

In more than thirty instances lightning is mentioned as having

struck prominent objects in Rome, followed sometimes by flames that did serious damage. Among the more important public structures so injured were the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus and the Colosseum, thrice; the temple of Quirinus, the temple of Salus, and that of Ceres, twice; the Pantheon, the home of Augustus, the Atrium Publicum (on the Capitoline), and numerous temples, such as those of Juno Lucina, Spes, Ops, Penates Dei, Pietas, Pax, Luna, and Jupiter Victor, once each. One cannot read the references to fires originating from lightning without reaching the conclusion that the thunderbolt in ancient Rome, either because of climatic conditions which are no longer operative or from some other cause not easily discoverable, was at once more frequent and more destructive than it is today.

The ultimate causes of fires at Rome, certainly of their wide range and destructive character, are clear enough. They are to be found in the materials used in construction (particularly in the earlier centuries), in the negligent methods of building, in badly congested residence and business areas, and in the numerous warehouses and granaries situated in densely populated sections and stored with inflammable material such as oil, grain, wool, wood, and lumber. These conditions deprived the ancient city of anything approaching the immunity from fire enjoyed by the modern capital. In the time of the early Republic Rome was little more than a country town, with its closely huddled huts and shops constructed mostly of primitive clay and osiers or of clay and wood and thatched with straw. Even the better private buildings were of wood and sun-dried bricks (*lateres crudi*), with sloping roofs of wood, shingles for roofing being in general use as late as the war with Pyrrhus (280 B.C.). The early temples were of roughly shaped blocks of stone, with upper parts of wood and with shingle roofs. In the city of Cato's time the houses were still generally built of wood and *lateres crudi*, the upper part in particular being constructed of timber framing filled in with plaited osiers and covered with mud and stucco, the so-called "wattle and daub," whose invention Vitruvius (II, 8, 20) regretted because it seemed to him "made to catch fire like torches."

Following this period the use of stone and tiles began, but it is probable that during the greater part of the Republic the majority of private houses were made of flimsy and easily combustible materials. Strabo (v, 3, 7), writing in the age of Augustus, remarks that for the city's enormous increase there was at hand an abundance of wood for ceaseless building, made necessary by the falling down of houses and also by their destruction by fire. Materials less easily combustible were increasingly used from the beginning of Augustus' reign, especially for the more important public structures, whose facings were of stone. But the burning of a wood roof was sufficient to destroy or at least severely injure buildings in which the other parts were more or less fireproof. And as for private buildings, well into the second century houses and tenements were generally of wood, many of them of unsubstantial and even dangerous construction. Juvenal (III, 8 and 193-97) tells us of the constant peril to life at Rome from houses tumbling down and houses propped up with wood and ready to collapse on account of structural weakness.

Despite the inference from existing remains, we must reject the notion that Rome's great public buildings were fireproof. Indeed from the frequency and extent of their injury by fire there must have been more wood in their construction than one would have expected to find. To take a few examples: The original temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, burned to the ground in 83 B.C., was of Etruscan architecture, low and heavy, nearly as broad as long (its great breadth being due to the admission of Juno and Minerva to share the temple with Jupiter), and with columns so widely spaced (nearly thirty feet) that heavy wooden architraves were used. In view of this feature, of the wooden roof, and of the widely projecting cornice necessary to protect the beams and ornamental plaster-work, we may well wonder how this building containing so much timber escaped loss by fire for more than four centuries. The stone amphitheater of L. Statilius Taurus was utterly destroyed by fire in A.D. 64, from which fact it is certain that the shell alone was of stone, while the great rows of seats and numerous staircases were of wood. The Circus

Maximus, also destroyed in good part in the fire just named, was highly inflammable in that the two upper tiers of seats were of wood, while around it on the outside ran a row of wooden shops and other small buildings. The Pantheon is fireproof, but the existing structure dates from a restoration by Hadrian. The destruction of the original Pantheon by fire in the year 80 and again in 111 is explicable only on the hypothesis that it contained a large amount of wood, especially in its upper parts. The great Colosseum of our wonder and admiration, whose remains suggest an absolutely fireproof building, was struck by lightning in the reign of Carinus (A.D. 217), its entire upper part and all the wood of the arena were burned, the whole structure was gutted by fire, and its beautiful stone and marble work was damaged, so that for some years the amphitheater was abandoned and the games transferred to the Circus Maximus. The intensity of this fire and the inability of the firemen to extinguish it is in itself an indication of the great quantity of wood used in the building. We know that the eleven highest rows of seats (not to mention a higher colonnade with wooden benches for the lowest classes) were of wood. Lanciani (*Ancient and Modern Rome*, p. 105), taking their aggregate length as 18,480 feet and estimating a framework strong enough to support 13,860 spectators occupying these seats, concludes that the quantity of timber accumulated near the top of the Colosseum approximated the enormous mass of 100,000 to 150,000 cubic feet.

The danger from fire in Rome inherent in a large-scale utilization of easily combustible building materials was greatly increased by negligent and imprudent methods of building. Owing to limitations in the building area selected and a tendency to follow lines of least resistance at the lower levels between and around the hills, houses and shops were built close together on narrow, tortuous streets and alleys from ten to twenty feet wide. Moreover, a population much too dense for the area occupied led to a great increase in the height of houses (Vitruvius II, 8, 17), with their huge upper timbers, balconies, bow windows, and other projections, which with frightful quickness caught the flames and com-

municated them. Thus fires were trebly dangerous, on account of the materials used for building, the height to which these were elevated (so high that water could not be raised by the firemen to the upper stories), and the narrowness of the streets on which the buildings stood. Narrow streets, of course, allowed little protection against the spread of flames, whether the building was low or high; but the tenement houses of many stories, with their small rooms, thin partition walls, wooden panels, and lattice work, were especially liable to burst into a blaze from exposure to any near-by fire. Suetonius in describing the conflagration of A.D. 64 mentions the great number of *insulae* destroyed, blocks of houses several stories high and consisting either wholly of separate apartments or of a large central mansion with small apartments surrounding but not communicating with it. Whichever type the *insula* took, it probably had shops around the outside on the ground floor, a feature that still further increased the risk of fire.

As suggested above, another of the fundamental causes of Rome's terrible conflagrations were the storage places for wood and lumber, warehouses, granaries, and shops, all of which contained rich materials for flames (either in storehouses proper or in shops connected with public buildings), with whose destruction the flames ordinarily after one to three days' destruction stopped their course. That fires in the areas about the Circus Maximus, Campus Martius, Forum, and the Sacra Via should, when once started, rage for a considerable time without being brought to a stop, is understandable from the nature of the materials on which they fed and the inadequacy of Rome's facilities for fighting such fires. The burning of shops connected with public edifices explains the ever recurring destruction by fire of buildings which otherwise neither by materials utilized in their construction nor by their use offered occasion for an outbreak of fire. On the other hand, if, despite insufficient means for extinguishing fires, the flames were confined to their place of origin and ended with the licking up of the materials stored there, the reason is that the buildings in such cases were either isolated from other structures or were surrounded by high walls.

Like many other primitive peoples the Romans regarded fire as a divine power, whose destructive force they sought to avert by religious rites. They worshiped fire as Vesta, the embodiment of the kindly hearth fire, and as Vulcan, who represented (principally at least) fire's destructive force. Vergil, Ennius, and Roman writers in general apply the name Vulcan to destructive fire, the kind that wrought such havoc among the wooden buildings of an ancient city. The Romans did not regard Vesta as representing a destructive power, nor was Vulcan, at least in historical times, considered a beneficent one.³ Vulcan was generally thought to be of an irascible disposition which always needed placation. At Ostia, where large granaries were filled with breadstuffs destined to feed Rome's great population, Vulcan was the object of an early and extensive cult. There he had a temple, a priest, and officers charged with providing sacrifices in his honor. In Rome the temple of Vulcan was located outside the walls (in the Campus Martius), that the city's buildings might be free from the terror of fires through the religious rites and sacrifices which called the power of Vulcan beyond the walls (Vitruvius 1, 7, 1). There was, however, a cult center of this divinity close by the Comitium, one of the oldest sanctuaries in the city. It consisted of an altar (remains of its foundations exist today) and a sacred enclosure (*Arca Volcani*), and was used as a place for propitiatory offerings against destructive fires. The principal worship of Vulcan at Rome was in connection with his annual festival (*Vulcanalia*) on August 23, when live fish were brought to the above mentioned sacred precinct and cast into the fire, the fish serving as a vicarious sacrifice for human lives thus saved from fire's destructive power. The effort to avert fires by expiatory rites is known also from a monumental record referring to the great fire of Nero's reign. Following that disaster the citizens of Rome made a vow of annual expiation ceremonies on altars raised in each of Rome's fourteen regions, but the vow was neglected until Domitian erected such altars. We have an inscription from

³ Cf. H. J. Rose, *Primitive Culture in Italy*: London, Methuen and Co. (1926), 43f; and Eli E. Burris, "The Use and Worship of Fire among the Romans," *Class. Wk.* xxiv (1930), 43-45.

a boundary stone surrounding one of these which shows that the purpose of the sacred area was not only to commemorate the fire of Nero's time, but also *incendiorum arcendorum causa* (*Corpus Inscript. Lat.* VI, 826).

Schooled by sad experience with fires Rome early began to consider human means for preventing them. The law of the *Twelve Tables* provided that there should be an open space of five feet between all adjacent buildings. In a short time, however, since dwellings were scarce, the provision was abandoned to the extent that buildings were constructed with a common partition wall in one side. In the early imperial period a regulation bearing on the height of houses and the thickness of their walls was in effect (Vitruvius II, 8, 17). Augustus reminded the senate of a speech of Rutilius (consul 105 B.C.) *de modo aedificiorum*, in order to convince its members that he was not the first to give attention to this important matter (Suetonius, *Augustus* LXXXIX). He also reduced the height of new buildings and forbade that any structure on the public streets should rise as high as seventy feet (Strabo v, 3, 7), from which it is apparent that in his time buildings were six or seven stories high. As a protection against fire, L. Calpurnius Piso constructed his city house of squared stone up to the very roof; and in this he was warmly commended by Augustus. Piso's example was followed by the emperors when they surrounded the imperial fora with high walls; but the salutary precautions noted cannot have been consistently observed, as is evident from the descriptions that have come down to us of the fire of Nero's reign and of the city of that time.

Nero made a series of regulations for the rebuilding of the city, which were intended to minimize the danger from fire (Tacitus, *Annales* xv, 43; and Suetonius, *Nero* xvi). A maximum height was placed on houses, probably seventy feet, since the limit was reduced to sixty by Trajan (Aurelius Victor, *Epit. de Caesaribus* XIII, 13). Open spaces were left between buildings, and porches or colonnades were erected in front of houses and apartments, from the flat parts of which fires could be effectively fought. Buildings up to a certain portion of their height had to be constructed without beams and had to be of fireproof stone. Party

walls were forbidden, and every house had to be enclosed within walls of its own. Householders were required to keep in some open place appliances for quenching fire. But it is noteworthy that in all these regulations not a word is said about the rear parts of buildings, where there must have been many additions, nor of balconies, bow windows, and other projections, which for some unaccountable reason seem not to have been prohibited until the year 368.

Space permits only a brief mention of Rome's effort through organized forces to check and extinguish fires. The city's fire department was a quasi-police force, and its members were known as sentinels or watchmen (*vigiles*). During the early Republic it was directed by three magistrates called *tresviri nocturni*, because their chief duty was to watch for the safety of the city and extinguish fires by night. These magistrates had at their disposal groups of state slaves (*familia publica*) stationed at various posts about the Servian wall and furnished with such necessary equipment for combating fires as ladders, axes, saws, ropes, and buckets. But the system did not work effectively, if we may judge from the frequency of fires recorded and from the fact that the *tresviri nocturni* were reinforced, perhaps in 186 B.C., by other magistrates (*tresviri capitales*), who were responsible for maintaining the night watch, and by *quinqueviri*, whose duty was to assist in directing the firemen (Livy xxxix, 14). The aediles also had a hand in managing fires. As time went on, however, and these *servi publici* were unable to cope with fires, companies of *familiae privatae* were occasionally used, with or without pay, as assistants (Dio Cassius l.iii, 24, 4; Juvenal xiv, 305-08; and Velleius Paterculus ii, 91, 3).

This inadequate and haphazard arrangement for securing protection from fire remained until the time of Augustus, who introduced changes. In 22 B.C. he formed a special body of six hundred state slaves as a fire brigade and put them under the direction of the aediles (Dio Cassius liv, 2, 4). Then in A.D. 6 he reorganized the service and enrolled for this purpose a body of seven thousand freedmen, divided into seven battalions (*cohortes*), the entire corps being commanded by an officer of the equestrian

order called *praefectus vigilium*, who had subordinate officers, *tribuni* for each battalion and *centuriones* for each company. The whole body of the *vigiles* was distributed and quartered throughout the city so that each battalion could watch two of the fourteen regions. This organization, which Augustus made as an experiment but retained when he discovered its value (Dio Cassius LV, 26, 5), was publicly supported by a share of the two per cent tax on the sale of slaves (*ibid.* LV, 31, 4). That it was made up of freedmen shows that Augustus wished to emphasize its nonmilitary character, for, save in emergencies (Suetonius, *Augustus* xxv), recruits for the army were still confined to citizens of free birth. But these freedmen by enlistment obtained Latin citizenship and, as their organization and service were quasi-military, they gradually won promotion; and in late times they were called soldiers (*Digest.* xxxvii, 13, 1).

The *vigiles*, in addition to the equipment mentioned above, were provided with other means for checking fires. One of the most important was the *centones*, blanket-like pieces of coarse materials, which were made wet and spread over buildings to prevent these from taking fire. Householders had at hand such fabrics with an abundance of vinegar (*acetum*) for dampening them. That these *centones* were commonly used in checking fires is evident from the fact that municipal firemen were called *centonarii*. Our sources make no mention of the *sipho*, a kind of engine, or force pump, for extinguishing fires; but there is indirect evidence of its employment in Rome in the time of Trajan. Pliny (x, 33, 2), writing of a great fire in Nicomedia, says that its spread was due both to the wind and to the lethargy of the people, but he adds that there was another reason also, *nullus usquam in publico sipho*, etc. There can be little doubt that Pliny in this instance is referring to the lack in Nicomedia of the same kind of equipment which was utilized in Rome at that period, probably earlier, in extinguishing fires. The *sipho*, of which no details are ascertainable, was probably a changed and improved model of the one which, according to Vitruvius (x, 7), was invented about 250 B.C. by Ctesibius, a mechanic of Alexandria, from whom it was called *Ctesibica machina*.

Notes

[All contributions in the form of notes for this department should be sent directly to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

THE ROMAN HORSESHOE

In a recent note entitled *Horseshoes in Antiquity* (the CLASSICAL JOURNAL xxvi [1931], 619f), Mr. Kaufman avers that "there is no evidence, either literary or archaeological, to indicate that horseshoes were nailed" on by the Greeks or Romans. He follows S. Reinach likewise (Daremberg et Saglio, s.v. "Mulomedicus") in maintaining that the episode in Suetonius (*Vespasian* xxiii, 2), wherein Vespasian's muleteer wastes his master's time by stopping to shoe the mules on the road, proves the absence of nails.

The nailed shoe is, however, not unknown to the archaeologist. The museum at Pompeii possesses two horseshoes (or muleshoes; Nos. 625 and 626) that consist of a thin plate of iron that covered the entire sole of the animal's foot, while a narrow rim, punctured with nail-holes, encompassed the lower part of the hoof. They are not unlike the "sole-rubbers" worn by humans. The mountain horses of the modern Greeks wear very similar shoes which cover all the sole, but they are nailed on from below and lack the offset rim. Strangely enough, no horseshoes are to be found, at least on exhibition, in the Museo Nazionale of Naples.

I do not know the place of origin of the type of horseshoe with which we are familiar, but it was widely used by the Romano-Britons of Imperial times. Quite possibly the Romans adopted this style from the Celts of Gaul or Britain. Almost every museum in England contains specimens which were discovered in association with Roman remains dating from the first century of our era onwards. They are small and more rounded than the modern horseshoe. All examples that I recall are thin, and the metal is forged into a wider band than we find in use today. They differ essentially from our shoes in being destitute of calks to prevent the foot's slipping, but they resemble ours in having two or three nail-holes on either side. A lashing of any kind —

even wire — is here out of the question, as it would have been worn away in short order by friction.

It thus becomes apparent that the Romans used at least two varieties of shoes that were attached by nails to the hoofs of horse or mule. It is idle, I think, to speculate on whether the shoes of Vespasian's mules were attached by nails or lashings. Kaufman assumes that the former process would call for "heating, shaping, and fastening," as it would in the shop of the modern farrier. But actually, the only essential would be the fastening, and that could be accomplished almost as rapidly by nails as by thongs. The basketlike "swamp-shoe," well known to museums, was of course bound to the foot of the animal in ancient just as in modern times. The *ferreae soleae* of the mule of Catullus (xvii, 26) conformed to this type.

Why are there so few Roman horseshoes extant? As the calked shoe seems to have been unknown, it is likely that cast-off *soleae* were repeatedly reattached till worn out. Broken scraps of the shoes would be reforged. The yielding earth of Britain has claimed more specimens than the harder soil of southern Europe. But it is doubtful, in any case, if many Roman horses were ever shod. It has always been a great deal of a puzzle to understand how the hoofs of Roman mounts or draft animals escaped destruction on the paving-stones of the roads. Some have postulated the use of a top layer of gravel or sand. But we are still very much in the dark. Reinach's articles dealing with the matter in Daremberg et Saglio are far from exhaustive. Mooney, who ought to be an authority on the subject, fails to mention anything relative to it except the gold shoes of Poppaea's mules; cf. *Travel Among the Ancient Romans*: Boston, R. G. Badger (1920), 72. Butler, in his recent book *Sport in Classic Times*²: London, E. Benn (1931), 37, n. 3, makes the mistake of attributing the origin of iron shoes to the ninth century. The whole question of how the ancients shod their cattle ought, by all means, to be subjected to a careful reexamination.

A. D. FRASER

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Book Reviews

[Review copies of classical books should be sent to the Editorial Office of the JOURNAL at Iowa City. Such works will always be listed in the department of Recent Books, and those which seem most important to the readers of the JOURNAL will also be reviewed in this department. The editors-in-chief reserve the right of appointing reviewers.]

FRANK BURR MARSH, *The Reign of Tiberius*: New York, Oxford University Press (1931). Pp. vi + 335. \$5.

As Professor Marsh's earlier book, *The Founding of the Roman Empire* (reviewed by me in this JOURNAL, XXIII [1928], 311f), dealt with the establishment of the principate, so this volume considers the collapse of the system under Tiberius. It is to be hoped that the series will be continued at least through the Julian-Claudian period. Marsh is no Weigall; but solid and substantial works of scholarship are the more needed as others than scholars, however brilliant, invade the field.

Marsh has given us chapters on "Tiberius and His Historians" (1-15), "The Legacy of Augustus" (16-44), "The Accession of Tiberius" (45-68), "Germanicus" (69-104), "The Early Government of Tiberius in Rome" (105-33), "Tiberius and the Empire" (134-59), "The Struggle for the Succession" (160-99), and "The Close of the Reign" (200-29). Appendices are provided on "The Sources of Tacitus" (233-66), "Kessler's Theory" (267-71), "Tacitus, Suetonius and Dio" (272-83), "Tacitus and the Tiberian Terror" (284-88), "The Law of Treason under Tiberius" (289-95), "The Elections under Tiberius" (296-303), and "The Conspiracy of Sejanus" (304-10); and these are followed by a list of works referred to in the notes and by genealogical charts of the Julian and Claudian families. The last would be improved by the addition of dates.

Appraisal of the book is not easy. It is clear that Marsh knows his sources and uses them with skill and discretion. The principal merit of the book, to my mind, is less its picture of the times than

its convincing portrayal of the emperor from the time of his accession. Tiberius has his faults and makes his mistakes, but the vices which Tacitus emphasizes not infrequently are proved by Tacitus' own evidence to be virtues. Marsh's method of selecting facts rather than interpretations from Tacitus' narrative is not new, but it is used with unusual effectiveness. Tacitus' obsession regarding Tiberius receives, on the whole, more charitable treatment than it would, e.g., from me, while Marsh leans very lightly on Velleius, on whom I should be inclined to place greater reliance. The Tiberius of Marsh wins respect if not affection. His rule in Rome down to the death of Drusus (Chapter V) and in the provinces throughout (Chapter VI) was good. The "reign of terror" after the death of Sejanus (Chapter VIII and Appendix IV) proves mainly imaginary. Tiberius turns out to be very human and therefore intelligible. He lacked tact; he committed blunders; he acted in haste sometimes. Yet this is mild condemnation compared to that of Tacitus.

While I am ready to accept Marsh's major points, though less willing to acquit Tacitus of malice, there are details of which I am less sure. I agree that Tiberius' eastern policy was dictated by political rather than economic motives (p. 82, n. 1); I am almost convinced that Sejanus' conspiracy was directed against Gaius rather than Tiberius (p. 193, n. 1, and Appendix VII), though I doubt if the emperor's death in the confusion would have seemed a real tragedy to Sejanus. I am not sure that Tiberius' position is quite accurately described as that of a sort of "emperor-regent" for Germanicus (p. 160, and elsewhere). I wish some legalist would decide whether Germanicus (descended from Augustus through a daughter) was really more in the direct line than the younger Drusus (descended through an adopted son). The answer might make many things clear. There is much more that I should like to present and much that I should like to argue in detail; but I pass over these matters to present one question that I wish had been discussed at length. The somewhat elementary second chapter presents objectively and thoroughly the system which Tiberius inherited from his adoptive father. Yet we are left insufficiently

aware of the tremendous personnel problem of Augustus, and we get little of Tiberius' own reactions. When we reflect on Tiberius' uncomfortable position under Augustus, we understand him a little better. He passed through years of doubt as to whether the half-promise of the throne would ever be fulfilled, years of doubt as to whether he could carry the burden if he did succeed. After his accession this personnel problem became his to solve, and he had years of wondering where, among the unpromising youth of the family — I think I am not too severe on Germanicus — he could find a successor to himself. Such experiences were enough to affect the character of any man. We find little of this in Marsh's book, but without something of it I fear that we miss part of Tiberius. Marsh has succeeded so well in personalizing Tiberius that I wish he had done more, that he had given us some of the glimpses he must have had into the emperor's soul. Perhaps this would be biography or fiction and not history; but if Marsh is no Weigall, he is even less a Thaddeus, and I for one could trust him.

I know no book dealing with this period that I should recommend to my students more gladly.

EVAN T. SAGE

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

EDWARD KENNARD RAND, *The Magical Art of Virgil*: Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press (1931). Pp. xi+458. \$5.

The mediaeval tradition regarding Vergil as a magician finds verification, in Rand's happy fancy, in the real magic of the poet's achievements in verse. Literary material, personal experience, environment, and a multitude of other mutually alien elements are transmuted by Vergil's alchemy into the fine gold of his poetry. Throughout the book there is an aversion, rarely expressed but always implied, to the mechanical procedure of the source-hunter, not perhaps to the intelligent source-hunting of Heinze, but to Jahn's methods in analyzing the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*. Rand's model is the masterpiece of his colleague, Professor Lowes, *The Road to Xanadu*. The closest counterpart to the material in Coleridge's notebooks is, in the case of the

Latin poet, Vergil's literary sources. Rand does not undertake any meticulous study of such sources but, fully aware of the facts that emerge from investigations by others, endeavors to suggest the creative process that fuses into artistic unity the literary tradition and other heterogeneous elements. Of course the inclusion of intangible and elusive factors, less concrete than the visible relation between Vergil's literary sources and his own poems, introduces a considerable amount of impressionism, intuition, divination, made attractive by the charm of the critic's style and the richness of his own literary experience. And necessarily the definiteness and validity of Lowes's conclusions can hardly be matched in Rand's interpretation of Vergil.

The value of the book, for readers either of the Latin or of English translations, is much increased by the complete analyses of the content of every eclogue and every book of the *Georgics*, as well as of the poems of the *Appendix*. The *Aeneid* is more summarily dismissed in three concluding chapters which emphasize the story of Dido and the art of the last six books.

The chapter on the *Appendix* repeats in general the author's earlier pronouncement in the *Harvard Studies* xxx (1919), 103-85. His conviction that the poems are genuine, except for the *Moretum* and the *Lydia*, may be passed over in respectful silence. In these earlier poems he finds "waves of epic feeling." The poet's magic in *Eclogues* II, III, V, and IV, according to Rand, effects a fusion of country life and the grand style of epic; even the ribaldry of the fifth poem, in contrast with Theocritus, is "epic ribaldry." This seems to me a strained interpretation. Is there not an innate dignity in the diction and general style of the Latin hexameter which makes the Vergilian pastoral more elevated than the fresh simplicity of most Theocritean pastoral? I doubt whether any purely Vergilian magic is responsible; nor, I must admit, do I enjoy this particular fusion. With other aspects of the bucolic poems Rand deals very happily. He is discreet and conservative in his handling of allegory; but in passing I raise the question whether the Servius who admits allegory only in connection with the confiscation of Vergil's estate can easily

be identified with the commentator on the first eclogue who declares (p. 150) that "the pines represent the city of Rome, fountains the eloquent senators, and orchard-trees the fruitful grammarians." In his interpretation of the scenic background the author is at his best. In moot questions raised by the poems Rand sides with those who find in the fourth a son of Pollio, and against Skutsch's interpretation of the sixth and tenth. In his warm enthusiasm for the bucolic poems Rand's prose is akin to the noble elegiac couplets in which William Ellery Leonard has celebrated the *Eclogues*. But in any truly critical evaluation of poetry, ancient or modern, can the literary historian greet the *Eclogues* with such unqualified praise as Rand bestows?

The *Georgics* is a very different matter. Hardly in the *Aeneid* is there as much noble poetry as in Vergil's essay on agriculture. Apart from a mass of illuminating suggestion on details Rand ascribes to Hesiod a larger degree of influence than most critics have been willing to grant. The magic of transmuting prose sources is almost entirely disregarded, either because it has been considered by others, or because Rand is averse to entering a field industriously plowed, if not cultivated, by Jahn. The omission leaves one with an impression of incompleteness regarding the poet's magical art. Rand's view (p. 255) that the famous passage, *felix qui potuit*, etc., followed by *fortunatus et ille*, is a challenge to Lucretius is difficult to accept. Vergil, says Rand, "insists that the world of Lucretius is a half-world; it is untrue to experience in its exclusion of religious faith, the faith professed by country folk." The passage does not seem to me to indicate a substantial compromise between philosophy and religion or a fusion of both; the recognition of rustic divinities is hardly more than a neat way of return from the alien eulogy of Lucretius to the main theme of the poem. Nor do I easily grant the critic's interpretation of the passage on the intelligence of the bees (iv, 219-41). Why need *resoluta referri* be strained so as to inject Epicurean atomic theory when otherwise the whole passage is consistently Stoic? I cannot see any "challenge to Lucretius" or any "warring philosophies." The *Georgics* is, in a sense,

a *pis aller* if these two passages are taken at their apparent value. But this need not mean that Vergil did not enter upon the task with zeal and interest and the full measure of his magic power.

The concluding chapters on the *Aeneid* recognize Vergil's indebtedness to tragedy, interpret sanely the story of Dido and the character of Aeneas, appreciate tastefully the epic of Apollonius and Vergil's relation to it, and estimate the fusion of antiquarian knowledge with the narrative of the last six books. As usual the author everywhere blends scholarship with literary taste and discrimination and so realizes a somewhat higher ideal than English, French, and Italian critics whom he delights to commend.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LA RUE VAN HOOK, *Greek Life and Thought*, a Portrayal of Greek Civilization²: New York, Columbia University Press (1930). Pp. ix+331. \$2.50.

The first edition of 1923 was reviewed by G. C. Scoggin in the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* XIX (1924), 251-53, where a general estimate of it may be seen. This edition is really a third printing with few changes. A different map opposite p. 6, showing Asia Minor as well, has been substituted for the map of Greece only. Some thirteen titles have been dropped from the Bibliography, and a supplement of forty-one titles is added. There are a dozen other minor changes by way of omission, insertion, and correction. A number of errors have been eliminated, including some noticed by Scoggin and the first date on p. 29. Some slips continued in the revised edition may be listed: "Extremely" is misspelled at the foot of p. 58. In line 7 of p. 59, "two" is needed before "friezes" to make the meaning of "the larger" in the next line clear. On p. 100 occurs the phrase, "Dicaeopolis, the charcoal-burner of the *Acharnians*"; but it was rather the Acharnians who were charcoal-burners, otherwise the point of the parody of tragedy in vss. 325-36 would be lost. One might question whether one statement at the foot of p. 155 is not too sweeping: "Reading, to the Greeks, meant not silent perusal of a text, but always

reading aloud." For example, in the *Knights* Demosthenes asks Nicias to give him the oracle so that he may read it (vs. 118). After some delay he discloses the contents in his own words, with Nicias impatiently asking questions. Plainly he had not first declaimed the whole text and then made his comment; otherwise Nicias would have heard him and not asked such questions; cf. Hendrickson, the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* xxv (1929), 192. On p. 245 "Ethics" is in the same sentence the subject of a singular verb and the antecedent of a plural pronoun. Perhaps when, on p. 247, the author is making a point of correcting the misconception of the unities, he still leaves Aristotle more dogmatic than he really is, in saying that he states "that the limit of a tragedy *should be* [my italics] a single revolution of the sun," rather than that "tragedy tries as far as possible to keep near" that limit.

None of these incidental points, of course, materially affects the recognized merit of this well-balanced and scholarly condensation of the essentials of Greek civilization.

CLYDE MURLEY

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

F. R. EARP, *The Way of the Greeks*: Oxford, University Press (1929). Pp. vii+223. \$3.

"Way" is not an excuse for miscellaneous comments; it means a specific attitude, typical of Greeks in general as shown in the several departments of life. This attitude involves the paradox that, though respecting tradition to a high degree and seeming at any moment to be saying or doing the customary thing (cf. Plato, *Symposium* 221E), they managed in the long run to be great innovators.

As sources for the average Greek's way of looking at things, the author trusts the orators most, and in about this order of dependability: Lysias, Andocides, Isaeus, Hyperides, Lycurgus, Demosthenes, Aeschines. The gnomic poets are useful, and Homer, since "coming before the age of conscious philosophy, he reflects the general mind" (p. 18). Hesiod has more bias. Herodotus is better than Thucydides (from whom, however, the author

probably draws more than from any other), because the latter, like the tragedians, often quotes a popular idea only to criticize it. The burlesque element vitiates Aristophanes' contribution, and New Comedy is heavily tintured with philosophy. Xenophon is a notably safe guide for so late a writer by reason of his strong conservative prepossessions.

The main theme is Greek morality. The author notes "the want of any general principle of morality," as also of any orthodoxy in religion or authoritative source for promulgating it. The Greeks had a sense of sins but not of sin, "had no word for moral" or unselfishness. It is unfair to judge their religion on a basis of dogma, so important to us, when they put the emphasis on ritual; or to judge their conduct on our qualitative basis, when their ethical standard was quantitative (the mean). There is an interesting description of the probable Greek criticism of Hebrew standards, and of their comparison of Lorenzo de' Medici to Savonarola to the ethical disadvantage of the latter. For to be an unbalanced fanatic (or infatuated with a woman) would be to them not an incidental oddity or weakness in an otherwise good person, but proof of his being pathological and thoroughly bad.

Considerable notice is given political morality. "Greek faith" is explained on the basis of the self-seeking, contractual nature of Greek friendship and patriotism (cf. the *Crito*); venality, in part, by poverty. Informal ties bound them less. "Humanity with us has become an instinct, with the Greeks . . . it was an aspiration" (p. 37). On pp. 37f and 217, without actually misquoting the evidence from Thucydides, the author so arranges it that it suggests a unity of opinion not really there. About practical admissions of Pericles (II, 63, 2), forced from him by the terrible combination of devastating war and plague, he weaves deliberate policies of Cleon (III, 37, 2 and 40, 2f). Pericles does not so much justify the tyranny as say that to give it up is no longer safe, and had earlier recommended refraining from further aggression (II, 65, 7). Personalities are important here, for Earp emphasizes the fact that tyranny and injustice between states are ac-

cepted by the "most illustrious statesman" of "the most humane and enlightened state of Greece at its most glorious hour" (p. 38). Yet in I, 75f the Athenian envoys give an apologetic account of the incidental and gradual development of the empire and the mixed motives which tended to enlarge and continue it (cf. I, 122, 3 and 124, 3). But, despite some coloring of Thucydides by Earp, it must be admitted that the Athenians by a close vote followed Diodotus (III, 49, 1) when his speech, though decenter, was more consistently Machiavellian than Cleon's in stressing advantage rather than humanity.

On the treatment of women, the author opposes two common beliefs: that they were essentially uneducated (for they were trained for their life as men for theirs, and "it is doubtful, too, whether the Athenian woman *felt* that she was uneducated" (p. 55, italics mine); and that *hetaerae* and callow youths were usually intellectually more stimulating than the allegedly stupid wives. The Athenians were not shocked at some sexual matters which shock us; but other things which do not shock us would shock them.

Earp draws constantly from first-hand sources, including art, of the bearing of which on the interpretation of Greek life he is everywhere conscious. He denies that Greek art is essentially cold, though its emotion is not explicit. His style is vigorous and pleasing. The book abounds in arresting sentences. "Greek art is an example . . . of the common paradox that art reaches its highest achievements when it does not know, theoretically, what it is doing, and when, according to some minds, it is in the bonds of some degrading servitude to morality or superstition" (p. 160). "It is this combination of maturity and freshness that makes Greek Literature and Art unique and restorative beyond any other" (p. 174). "Greek Literature is often sad, but it is sad with the sadness that springs from love of life, not from distrust of it or weariness" (p. 176). "The search for novelty of treatment and subject begins . . . when the belief in life and the zest of living begin to fail" (p. 177).

CLYDE MURLEY

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

MARI RUEF HOFER, *Festival and Civic Plays from Greek and Roman Tales*² (Educational Play-Book Series): Chicago, Beckley-Cardy Co. (1931). Pp. 237. \$1.25.

The reviewing of a book written by an author recently deceased is always a sorrowful task. It is particularly so in this case because one is compelled to the belief that if Mari Ruef Hofer had lived longer she would have exerted an ever increasing influence on school dramatics.

*Festival and Civic Plays*¹ is intended as a source of material for teachers in grades five to nine who wish to do constructive work in play and pageant building. In most cases the plays are complete, but in a few instances the story is merely outlined for original dramatic work on the part of the pupils. Since the author believed in the use of scenery for all school plays, there are numerous suggestions for the construction of sets and elaborate properties. There are also brief directions for the construction of costumes and for the use of make-up.

The plays are skillfully adapted to the interests and dramatic needs of school children. Especially successful are those entitled "Jason and the Golden Fleece," "Atalanta's Race," "Arachne and Athena," "Pomona and Vertumnus," "The Choice of Coriolanus," and "Caractacus and the Romans." In several of the mythological plays difficult changes of form are handled in an unbelievably simple and clever manner; and even such problems as the slaying of monsters and the passage of the Symplegades, all on the stage before the audience, are solved quite satisfactorily.

The newer edition differs from the first in minor details only. It is unfortunate, in view of the numerous excellent features of the book, that so many serious errors remain. The cover still shows ancient Greeks walking over the ruins of Greek buildings and reading scrolls turned the wrong way. In the naming of Roman characters, praenomina, nomina, and cognomina are still hopelessly confused, and impossible names like Tito, Lela, etc.

¹ The first edition appeared in 1926 and was reviewed in the CLASSICAL JOURNAL XXII (1927), 633f.

are still found. There is misspelling, misuse of words like "oracle," misunderstanding of such features of ancient life as the Apella, the Forum, the ancient house, the Bema, the Pnyx, the symposium, the paedagogus, the "Socratic method," plebeians, and others. The pronouncing vocabulary still contains erroneous information on sounds and diphthongs and much faulty accentuation such as Arcad'ia, Cin'cinnatus, Corio'li, Ic'tinus, Romu'-lus, sat'yr, etc. We can well believe, however, that but for the death of the author these details would all have been taken care of before publication. Even as it stands, the book will be a welcome addition to the list of plays peculiarly suited to school performance.

LILLIAN B. LAWLER

HUNTER COLLEGE

H. ST. J. THACKERAY, *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, Books I-IV*, with an English Translation, Vol. IV (Loeb Classical Library): New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons (1930). Pp. xix + 649. \$2.50.

The recent death of Dr. Thackeray was a great loss to Hellenistic studies. It is only recently that English and American scholars have ceased to think of Greek literature as ending with Demosthenes or perhaps with Theocritus, although Hellenistic history as a whole has had notable exponents in such men as Bevan, Ferguson, Tarn, to mention only a few. Thackeray brought wide erudition and a real enthusiasm to his task and in the Loeb edition of Josephus, of which this is the fourth volume, has given us the best documented critical edition which the considerable work of this extraordinary person has so far received in English.

The quality of Thackeray's translation I have indicated in previous reviews in the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* XXIII (1927), 230-35 and XXIV (1928), 223-26. It is certainly accurate in the main, but it is a pedestrian and slightly pale accuracy and frequently yields both in vigor and felicity to the old version of Whiston. That is after all no great matter, since Thackeray was primarily

concerned with the problem of interpretation, a difficult enough task when, as may have been the case of Josephus, the writer had insufficient Greek and his assistants too much and when the eagerness of an apologetic purpose often obscures the expression.

Studies in Josephus have dealt almost exclusively with the Maccabean and Herodian period for which he is sometimes our sole authority. Doubtless this is natural enough, but it remains inexplicable that so little has been attempted with so large a body of text as the rest of Josephus' ambitious undertaking. The limitations of the Loeb Classical Library make it impossible for this edition to be equipped with a full commentary, and a full commentary Josephus imperatively needs. There is, in fact, to the scandal of scholarship, no completely annotated edition in existence, although the excellent French edition, prepared by the late Theodore Reinach and his colleagues, is an approach to it. Thackeray leans heavily on it, as he must, for a discussion of the traditional elements in Josephus both in respect to *Halacha* and *Hagada*, the oral law and popular folk lore.

There is still much to be done. There are a great many more instances than those noted in this volume in which Josephus has suppressed or changed a Biblical passage that might give offense, as in the case of the "spoiling of the Egyptians" (II, 315). In III, 286, on the contrary, Thackeray has introduced an anthropomorphism which Josephus was careful to avoid.

Professor Louis Ginzberg of New York has, in his *Legends of the Jews*, put together a great many of the traditional embellishments of the Biblical story, mostly from the many *Midrashim*, early and late. These might well be compared with Josephus. Again, the New Testament, especially the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, contains traditional material which is not in the Pentateuch but appears in Josephus. We may cite *Hebrews* IX, 21f as compared with Josephus, *Antiquities* III, 206.

It is certainly to be hoped that the notes which Thackeray has left will enable his task to be completed. And it is even more desirable that scholars conversant with both Hellenistic and Jewish sources set themselves earnestly to examine with far greater

thoroughness than anyone has yet attempted the highly significant and extensive material presented by the *Antiquities*.

MAX RADIN

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY

ROY J. DEFERRARI, *Saint Basil, The Letters*, with an English translation, Volume III (Loeb Classical Library): New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons (1930). Pp. xv + 489. \$2.50.

Dr. Deferrari maintains in this volume the same level of competent scholarship manifested in the first two volumes of the series. The present work includes Letters CLXXXVI to CCXLVIII. The translator has properly gauged the importance of the Canonical Letters, CLXXXVIII, CXCIX, and CCXVII. His Introduction and Commentary in connection with this group are carefully conceived and executed, serving as an excellent guide not only to the specialist but also to the general student of antiquity. For the specialist the value of these Canonical Letters lies in the detailed information concerning the public treatment of penitents in the Eastern churches during the latter part of the fourth century. For the student of civilization they are important for the light they shed on the intense preoccupation of the age with personal morality and the assumption by the church of the power of regulating the morals of communicants. There is seen also the growing tendency to dim the lines dividing "the things that are Caesar's and the things that are God's."

Aside from the Canonical Letters the student will find fresh material for a first-hand investigation of the theological controversies that raged throughout the century. Moreover, he will find in Letter CCVII an unusually eloquent and moving apology for asceticism as a way of life as well as a beautiful and vivid picture of one form of early Christian worship.

Throughout the volume there are abundant footnotes dealing both with textual questions and with questions of translation and interpretation. It is unfortunate that the Index is concerned only with proper names. Perhaps it is an oversight that the name of

Philo is omitted from the Index. Letter cxc contains a highly interesting fragment from Philo, who, although a Jew, was the *fons et origo* of much patristic ideology.

STERLING TRACY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

HORACE LEONARD JONES, *The Geography of Strabo*, with an English Translation, Vol. VII (Loeb Classical Library): New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons (1930). Pp. 379. \$2.50.

This is the seventh volume of the translation of Strabo and contains books xv and xvi with a map of Asia and a partial Dictionary of Proper Names. There are interesting passages in these two books such as that on elephants (pp. 71-75). Another volume will complete this excellent translation and revised Greek text. The same criticisms which were made of previous volumes in the CLASSICAL JOURNAL XXIV (1929), 541-43, and XXVI (1930), 241f, will apply to this volume. The Greek text is much improved, and there are many critical notes on the text. The translation is accurate and in good English. A few notes have been added on the content of Strabo, such as a reference (p. 33) to Miss Richter's article on "Silk in Greece" in the *American Journal of Archaeology* xxxiii (1929), 27-33, and a remark that by "Byssus" Strabo undoubtedly means silk, supposing it to be a kind of cotton. This volume profits by Professor Jones' recent year abroad as Annual Professor in the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, which gave him an opportunity to travel and visit some of the places described by Strabo. So, e.g., there is a note on the Dead Sea (p. 294) to the effect that on a recent visit (December, 1929) the translator found that Strabo's whole account is substantially correct. "As for floating, a very corpulent person could walk out only up to the navel before floating, but a very lean person up to the shoulders." I quote Jones' rendering (p. 295) of the Strabo passage as a specimen:

The asphalt is a clod of earth, which at first is liquefied by heat, and is blown up to the surface and spreads out; and then again, by reason of the cold water, the kind of water the lake in question has, it changes to a

firm, solidified substance, and therefore requires cutting and chopping; and then it floats, because of the nature of the water, owing to which, as I was saying, there is no use for divers; and no person who walks into it can immerse himself either, but is raised afloat. They reach the asphalt on rafts and chop it and carry off as much as they each can.

I still believe, as I said in my reviews of the previous volumes, that we ought to have very short notes giving a reference to the excavations or their publications for important cities mentioned by Strabo. Certainly even the layman is interested in knowing that Taxila (p. 47) in India has been excavated and a city unearthed with a Macedonian plan of house and streets. The comment on Opis and Seleuceia (p. 205) would interest the layman if he were told about the American and other excavations there, as much as a statement that Bruno Meissner in a German journal *Klio* xix (1925), 103, understands Strabo to mean that Opis and "the present Seleuceia" are identical. But this is perhaps a minor matter and must be left for the large German edition, which is soon to appear. Jones is to be congratulated on his promptness in bringing to completion a difficult task on which he has labored long and hard with a text which was in bad shape.

DAVID M. ROBINSON

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

JAMES TURNER ALLEN, *The First Year of Greek*³: New York, Macmillan Company (1931). Pp. 383+viii. \$2.25.

As Professor Allen stated in the Preface to his first edition of this book, published in 1917, it is planned especially for students who begin Greek in college and deserve to get as much richness of content as possible during a short time. Consequently he aimed to present the most essential grammatical principles in concise form and to provide the sort of reading that would interest college students.

Many teachers of Greek had long felt the need of such a book. To drill mature students on Xenophon's *Anabasis* for an entire year seemed an ungracious way of introducing them to Greek literature, when a wealth of equally usable and more profitable

material was available. Allen's original and carefully prepared project was therefore warmly welcomed.

After using the book for several years, I am convinced that students enjoy this treatment vastly more than the conventional sort; they could hardly help doing so, since they read passages from Plato, the New Testament, the dramatists, poets, and historians. Their vocabulary becomes more varied and useful; they appreciate sooner the beauty of Greek literature. But the book also has its shortcomings. Owing to the relative difficulty of some of the passages chosen, grammatical usages like the subjunctive and optative are introduced too early in the course; students are referred to the grammar in the rear of the book, instead of finding all the material for the day's lesson compactly presented, and the exercises in composition (also grouped apart from the lessons) are extremely inadequate. These are rather serious disadvantages, especially for the student who expects to continue in Greek and should have a thorough grounding in grammar and composition during his first year. They might have been avoided in a radically revised edition.

Instead, in his revision of 1928 Professor Allen merely added an English-Greek vocabulary and an index to the grammar; and in this revision, aside from a few minor corrections and changes, he is content to substitute for the continuous reading of the *Protagoras* (Lessons L-LXVIII) passages from the *Memorabilia* and the *Phaedo*. The wisdom of this may be questioned. The *Protagoras* is, of course, difficult, but it does appeal to students so that they respond to it eagerly.

In spite of its shortcomings, which can be largely overcome by skillful teaching, the book succeeds admirably in encouraging a lively interest in beginning Greek among college students, a result the value of which can hardly be exaggerated.

WALTER R. AGARD

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Hints for Teachers

[Edited by Calla A. Guyles, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. The aims of this department are threefold: to assist the inexperienced teacher of Latin, to help the experienced teacher keep in touch with matters of interest in the professional world, and to serve as a receiving center and distributing point for questions and contributions on teaching problems. Questions will be answered by mail or in the pages of this department. Contributions in the form of short paragraphs dealing with projects, tests, interest devices, methods, and materials are requested. All correspondence should be addressed to the editor of this department.]

Question Box

What difference is there in the pronunciation of HOC and HŌC? What is the difference between CUM and CŪRŌ? How are QUĪ and CŪĪ pronounced?

The vowels *ū* and *ū* differ in quality as well as in quantity; the vowel sounds in the English words "full" and "fool" represent respectively *ū* and *ū*. The *ū* is called more open, i.e. the lips are left more open, not rounded and closed so much. Similarly *ō* is more open than *ō*. The "o" in "obey" represents the Latin *ō* fairly well, while Latin *ō* is about as in "tone," although our English "o" in such words ends with a slight "u" sound and so is really diphthongal, not a pure long vowel. The difference between *quī* and *cūī* is more difficult to make clear. The *quī* is like the English "queen" without the "n." The monosyllabic *uī* in *cūī* will perhaps be grasped best by trying to pronounce "coo-ee" rapidly enough to make it a monosyllable (a diphthongal *uī*), while keeping the accent on the "coo."

Do you know of any good book on Latin pronunciation? Please send the name and publisher.

Any recognized Latin Grammar will have a section discussing pronunciation fully. If you want more detailed information, you will find it in *The Latin Language* by Charles E. Bennett, published by Allyn and Bacon, Chicago. The catalogue price is \$1.40.

Music and Latin

Have you seen the recently published musical settings to some of the favorite odes of Horace by William Gow and David Coutts,

Odes of Horace Arranged for Singing in Schools and Colleges; Oxford, University Press (1930)? At a recent meeting of the McMaster Classical Club some of these were sung with great acceptance. *O fons Bandusiae* and *Divis orte bonis* were favorites. In the case of the latter and longer ode the soloist sang the first few stanzas, and the rest were sung community-wise. The composer has a right understanding of Horatian meters as well as an ear for melody. Some of the younger students confessed that these musical settings gave them their first real appreciation of the less known meters. Some of us who have winced under the disregard for quantity displayed in that otherwise beautiful setting of *Integer vitae* to which our hymn books have accustomed us will find solace in the fine rendering Gow gives of that Sapphic ode.

CLEMENT H. STEARN

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
HAMILTON, ONT.

Word Ancestry

"I'm plumb done up," said Jean, as she sought the shade on a hot afternoon after a swift game of tennis. Now that was just Jean's way of saying that she was "completely exhausted," but the chances are that when she said "plumb" the thought of "lead" did not enter her mind, though she is in third-year Latin at high school. "And why should it?" you will perhaps ask.

Let us go back a little way. When a wall is "out of plumb" it is not perpendicular — it leans one way or the other. In building a wall its perpendicularity is tested by a plumbline, which, as you know, is a cord by which is suspended a leaden weight. "Lead" in Latin is *plumbum*, and that is why we call it a plumbline. It is not difficult to see how our adjective "plumb" takes the extended meanings "tested, exact, complete," and how it is used adverbially to signify "exactly, completely." So Jean's use of it, even if verging on slang, seems etymologically justified. By the way, the Latin word for plumbline is *perpendicularum*, and this will suggest *pendere*, "to cause to hang down, to suspend."

Now, to return to *plumbum*, the leaden weight attached to a mariner's sounding line is called "plumb," or "plummet." This line measures the depth of water; with it the mariner "plumbs" the ocean depths. Figuratively, one may plumb the depths of sorrow, or plumb another person's motives.

And we almost forgot the poor plumber! He is thus called because he originally worked with lead, but nowadays he works with all sorts of materials, including porcelain.

WILLIS A. ELLIS

LOMBARD, ILL.

Review of Types of Constructions

Occasionally every class can profit by an organized review of constructions where the stress is upon construction and not upon vocabulary. A series of sentences such as the following may be used periodically from the first year to the last of Latin study:

The son of the king leads the men from the city to the river.

The men are led by the king's son.

Who leads the men?

Which man leads?

He says the king leads the men.

will lead the men.

has led the men.

They say the men are led to the river.

will be led.

have been led.

He asks who leads the men.

He asks which men are being led.

They will ask which men are being led.

They say the king is about to lead the men.

They say the men must be led by the king.

The king leads the men in order to capture the city.

The king leads so many men that he captures the city.

When the king led the men, he captured the city.

When the city was captured, the king led the men to the river.

While the king was capturing the city, he fought bravely.

He sends the men to capture the city. [Four ways of expressing purpose.]

If the king leads the army, he will capture the city.
 If the king were leading the army, he would capture the city.
 He placed the men in charge of the city.
 He has sent the men as aid to the city.
 He uses the horses so that he may get possession of the city.
 They fought many days and in the middle of the night they captured the city.
 He persuaded the men to capture the city.

EDITH B. PATTEE

UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL
 EUGENE, ORE.

Wedges

In presenting the past tense for the first time I use the "wedge." First I make sure everyone knows what a wedge is. Then I give them this wedge on the board $\begin{smallmatrix} ba \\ \vee \end{smallmatrix}$. Then I take some present tense form with which they are familiar, such as *vocat*. Then as I draw at the board, I tell them that we wedge the *ba* between the stem and ending. And then I give the completed form *voca* $\begin{smallmatrix} ba \\ \vee \end{smallmatrix}$ *t* = *vocabat*. I speak of a wedge for quite a while, even until I have presented the future tense. Some pupils never get out of the habit of saying "wedge in *ba*" for the formation of the past tense, and I have no objections.

D. PAUL SOUDERS

BRADFORD, PA.

When Studying a New Declension

To present a new declension, place on the board five sentences each of which contains one form of a word in the new declension in the singular and five more for the plural. Designate which are singular and which are plural. Let there be no other new elements in the sentences. These sentences naturally depend on the text used. For example, put these sentences on the board:

- | | |
|----------|-------------------------------------|
| SLAVE | 1. <i>Agricola SERVUM habet.</i> |
| | 2. <i>Rosam SERVO dat.</i> |
| Singular | 3. <i>Puella CUM SERVO ambulat.</i> |
| | 4. <i>SERVUS agricolam videt.</i> |
| | 5. <i>Rosa SERVI est pulchra.</i> |

In the same manner write five more for the plural.

Note that all the other words are familiar, that the new declension is emphasized, and that the whole attention is concentrated on the new declension.

Procedure:

1. Call on pupils to translate the sentences.
2. Call on pupils to translate and also state the case.
3. Repeat if necessary.
4. Send pupils to the board to fill in this case chart, using full word:

II Declension Masculine

Singular		Plural
.....	Nominative
.....	Genitive
.....	Dative
.....	Accusative
.....	Ablative

D. PAUL SOUDERS

BRADFORD, PA.

A Device for Testing and Drilling for Speed and Accuracy

An encouraging feature of the more modern texts for beginners in Latin is the increased use of connected reading material as an aid in mastering forms and syntax. As the average teacher, however, will still find a certain amount of formal drill indispensable, I venture to suggest the following device which may be unfamiliar to the less experienced and which I have found very useful as a means of stimulating interest and helping students to make a proper estimate of their own attainments.

One or more word-lists are placed on the board for purposes of declension or conjugation, as the case may be. If several lists are used, they must be of equal difficulty. The students are then sent to the board to write the paradigms as rapidly as possible. When board space is limited, some work at their seats. Each student works individually and tries to make the highest possible score in a given period of time. Errors are checked by the teacher

as rapidly as possible and must be corrected before the student is allowed to proceed. Each declension and tense completed is scored on the basis of 100. Copying is discouraged by using alternating lists or placing students of unequal ability side by side. Since completed units must be erased as soon as they have been graded, slow students are too quickly outdistanced by more brilliant neighbors to find much opportunity for "borrowing." At a given signal work is stopped, and each individual computes his score for the day. Scores are compared and recorded by the class secretary.

A drill of this type affords both teacher and students an excellent means of checking accuracy and speed of recall and seldom fails to prove a great stimulus to individual effort. This is especially true when scores are allowed to accumulate from day to day. When the latter plan is followed, classes tend to divide naturally into groups of similar ability with individuals competing against one another within the various groups. Competition in improving scores seems to appeal to older students as well as younger ones, and I have known college students to master difficult forms in a surprisingly short time after making an unfavorable initial showing.

Similar exercises may be worked out for testing and increasing ability in composition; in this work groups of sentences are placed on the board for translation or are assigned from a text. Since the student is required to correct all errors and look up the words which he has forgotten, he soon learns to appreciate the value of mastery as a time saver in the learning process.

While a recitation of this type is rather strenuous from the standpoint of the teacher, who must grade continuously at maximum speed, the increase in interest and corresponding decrease in failure and detention lists are ample rewards for the extra effort involved.

HELEN E. LOTH

STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
SUPERIOR, WIS.

Latin Basic Drill Units

For the teacher who believes in student activity and self-help, the *Latin Basic Drill Units* prepared by F. H. Potter of the department of Latin and Greek of the State University of Iowa and F. B. Knight of the College of Education of the same university will prove useful. There are two parts of 171 pages each, one for first semester and one for second. They include drills on minimum essentials for beginners, declensions, conjugations, syntax, comprehension, vocabulary, and pronunciation. The pads are eight and one-half by eleven inches in size; and each sheet has on the back the correct answers printed in such a way that the student, by folding the paper as directed, can check his own work with a minimum of effort and time. They are published by Rand McNally and Company (Chicago), and the list price is sixty cents per pad.

Myths for Children

An attractive book of myths for children of high-school age as well as for the younger ones is *A Child's Book of Myths* written by Margaret Evans Price and published by Rand McNally and Company (Chicago). The list price is \$1.50.

A Latin Treasure Hunt

Since our Senior Latin class was large, we divided it into two bands. We have a whole block of territory, and the "hidiers" were free to put their clues and their final treasure anywhere on the grounds. The clues were written in Latin with enough of the hard words in English to make interpretation fairly easy for Seniors.

The girls had a glorious time. One treasure was hidden within the school, the other out on the grounds. Each set of clues was accurate, though the Latin was not all one might desire. Each band had seven clues, I think, and then the lucky "first man" got the treasure — an inexpensive but much appreciated prize. The clues were really ingenious. I could hardly believe that they could think up such interesting places to put the clues, and the commit-

tee responsible for the entertainment was entirely responsible for this detail.

The entertainment took half an hour of a glorious October day, and the hunters were all ready for anything when they returned to the Latin room. One treasure consisted of nuts; so they all had a party and ate up the prize.

CONTRIBUTED

A Book for Connected Reading

Those who know the previous editions of Ritchie's *Fabulae Faciles* will be glad to hear of the new edition, edited by John C. Kirtland, Morison Professor of Latin at Phillips Exeter Academy. It contains a new feature, exercises in connected narrative for English to Latin translation. The words in the College Board Vocabulary list for the first two years are indicated by asterisks. There are additional illustrations, which add to the attractive appearance of the book. The publishers are Longmans, Green and Company, 221 East Twentieth St., Chicago. The list price is 88c.

Latin for Eighth Grade

During the past year we have been teaching eighth-grade Latin largely through games, many of which have been original with the children. One game in particular has proved interesting and beneficial. We placed on the blackboard a list of English sentences; the Latin translations, typed on cards and cut into divisions, were passed; thereupon the children raced in putting the divisions together to form a complete sentence. This has proved such a splendid aid to teaching correct forms and sentence arrangement that I feel that perhaps other teachers of eighth-grade Latin may find it helpful.

GEORGIANN BURGE

MISS NEWMAN'S SCHOOL
DETROIT

Current Events

[Edited by Clarence W. Gleason, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass., and John Barker Stearns, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., for territory covered by the Associations of New England and the Atlantic States; Daniel W. Lothman, East High School, Cleveland, O., for the Middle States east of the Mississippi River; George Howe, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., for the Southeastern States; Walter Miller, the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., for the Southwestern States; and Franklin H. Potter, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia., for the territory of the Association west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Louisiana and Texas. News from the Pacific Coast may be sent to Frederic S. Dunn, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.]

This department will present everything that is properly news of general appeal, but considerations of space compel the editors to ask that items be made as brief as possible. Whenever feasible, it is preferable to print programs of meetings which would draw an attendance from a large area as live news in advance of the date rather than as dead news after the event. In this connection it should be remembered that the November issue, e.g., appears on October fifteenth and that items must be in hand five or six weeks in advance of this date.]

American School at Athens

The American School of Classical Studies at Athens was founded by the Archaeological Institute of America in 1881. In 1886 it was organized as a corporation under the laws of the State of Massachusetts. It is supported in part by the cooperation of leading American universities and colleges, in part by the income of endowment funds. No charge for tuition is made to graduates of the supporting institutions. Three fellowships (two School Fellowships, and the Institute Fellowship), with a stipend of \$1400 each, are awarded on examination. The examinations for the fellowships in 1931-32 will be held in March, 1932. Correspondence about fellowships should be addressed to Professor Benjamin D. Merritt, Ann Arbor, Mich. The Director of the School is Rhys Carpenter. For 1931-32 Samuel E. Bassett of the University of Vermont is the annual professor, and Frank C. Babbitt of Trinity College the visiting professor.

Laconia, New Hampshire

A meeting of the classical section of the State Teachers' Association was held at Laconia, N. H., on October 16, 1931. Royal C. Nemiah of Dartmouth College delivered an address upon the subject, "Graecia Capta." The officers for the past year were reelected.

New England Classical Association, Western Massachusetts Section

The annual meeting of the Western Massachusetts Section of the New England Classical Association was held at Williston Academy, Easthampton, on October 31. The Academy placed at the disposal of the Section the exceptionally pleasant Dodge Memorial Room in the new athletic building, and luncheon was served in the new dormitory. At the opening of the morning session Principal Galbraith welcomed the members of the Association to their meeting in the new buildings of a school which has maintained a tradition of classical teaching for ninety years. Henry D. Wild of Williams College, who presided, responded in behalf of the section. Two papers were then read: "Humor and Fancy in the Georgics" by Cornelia C. Coulter of Mount Holyoke College, and "The Modernizing of the Latin Course" by Lincoln D. Granniss of Williston Academy. The rest of the morning was devoted to simultaneous informal conferences: one of secondary-school teachers with Walter V. McDuffee of the Springfield Central High School as chairman; the other of college teachers, at which Florence A. Gragg of Smith College presided. The questions brought up at the secondary-school conference, together with the answers indicated by a consensus of opinions, are reported by Mr. McDuffee as follows: (1) Do the new second-year Latin books fit for Cp 2? Yes. (2) Is the study of Vergil vital in secondary schools? Yes. (3) What is the effect of the 6-3-3 plan on Latin? Not adverse if the quality of the teaching is good. Otherwise very bad. (4) When should Latin be begun in junior high school? Middle of eighth year. (5) What is the effect of reading Vergil in the third year and Cicero in the fourth (as is done by choice in a few schools and from necessity in others, where work has to alternate because of small classes)? On the whole not bad. Any disadvantage to the Vergil seems offset by advantage to the Cicero. At the college conference the following subjects were discussed: The present status of Greek in the several colleges of Western Massachusetts; the best way of dealing with exceptionally able students of classics in Freshman and Sophomore years, with the advantages and disadvantages of "honor" divisions; the effect of courses in classical literature in translation on courses in Latin and Greek; the extent of the use of translations by students in courses in Latin and Greek; and the attitude of faculty and students towards the use of translations. It may be remarked that the reduction of the number of formal papers on the program and the initiation of the informal conferences just described constitute an interesting innovation planned, to quote the words of the Executive Committee, "to provide three things — a scholarly and literary program, a clearing-house of ideas, and a satisfying reunion." At the afternoon session Alfred C. Schlesinger of Williams College gave an account,

under the title of "Mediterranean Notes," of a Vergilian cruise of last summer. The Section accepted an invitation from Northfield Seminary to hold its next meeting at that school.

Ohio Classical Conference

The tenth annual meeting of the Ohio Classical Conference was held at Marietta College on October 29-31, 1931. Sophocles' *Antigone* was performed by the students of Marietta College under the direction of Geneva Stephenson, and the following program of papers was presented: "Cassiodorus, the Last of the Romans" by Rodney P. Robinson of the University of Cincinnati; "An Icelandic Translation of Sallust and Lucan" by J. A. Ness of Wittenberg College; "Helping the Classical Student to Realize His Opportunities" by Joseph A. Kiefer of John Carroll University; "Homer's Epithets and Similes" by Eleanor F. Rambo of Lake Erie College; "The High-School Teacher of Latin and French" by Lillian Colley of Portsmouth High School; "The Classical Honor Society" by Lucy Brokaw of Cadiz High School; "The College Entrance Board Latin Examination" by Albert T. Waldron of the University School, Cleveland; "Junior High School Latin and the Changing Educational Situation" by Ruth Dunham of Lakewood High School; "The Shield of Aeneas" by Jennie Lewis of Scott High School, Toledo; "The Sculptures of the Theater of Corinth" (illustrated) by Edward Capps, Jr., of Oberlin College; "Some Observations on the Teaching of Latin in the High School" by H. W. Leach of Central High School, Lima; "The Permanent Validity of the Greek Architectural Orders" (illustrated) by John B. Kelso of Wooster College; "The Use of Linguistic Science in the Teaching of Foreign Languages" by Caroline Nielson of Bowling Green State College; "The Preclassical Age in Greece" by Carl W. Blegen of the University of Cincinnati; "In the Beginning" by Louis E. Lord of Oberlin College; "The Foundations of Culture" by Reverend David E. Adams of Marietta; "The Place of Language in Education" by H. F. Scott of Ohio University; "Historical Fiction for the High-School Latin Class" by Catherine G. Wilson of Millersburg High School; "The Place of Culture Subjects in the High-School Curriculum" by B. O. Skinner, Director of Education for the State of Ohio; and "Helen of Troy and the Moralists" by W. L. Carr of Teachers College, Columbia University. H. F. Scott of Ohio University and Leigh Alexander of Oberlin College were reelected as president and secretary-treasurer respectively for another year. The Conference completed the task of raising \$1,500 toward a permanent endowment fund for its expenses.

Parkville, Missouri

Another member of our Association, a truly great teacher of the classics and the senior professor on the faculty of Park College, was called to his reward July 2, 1931. Professor Wolfe was born at Montclair, N. J., September 16, 1866, and graduated from New York University with the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1889 and the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in 1892. He did further graduate work at the University of Leipzig and at the American School of Classical Studies in Rome. He became professor of Latin (and afterwards of Classical Languages) at Park College in 1889 and filled that position with rare success, beloved of students and colleagues, for forty-two years, acting also as dean and as president of the college from 1913 to 1915. He was an active member of the Classical Association of Kansas and Western Missouri, serving as its president in 1921. He was also a devoted member of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, and his contributions to the *JOURNAL*, though few, have been admirable in form and in content. — WALTER MILLER.

Recent Books¹

[Compiled by Russel M. Geer, Brown University.]

- ALLEN, PHILIP S., *Medieval Latin Lyrics*: Chicago, University of Chicago Press (1931). Pp. ix+341. \$4.
- ANDERSON, PAUL L., *For Freedom and for Gaul*: New York, D. Appleton and Co. (1931). Pp. ix+295. \$2.
- ASH, HARRISON BOYD, *L. Iuni Moderati Columellae Rei Rusticae Liber Decimus: De Cultu Hortorum*, Text, Critical Apparatus, Translation, and Commentary: Philadelphia, privately printed (1930).
- BABBITT, FRANK COLE, *Plutarch, Moralia*, Vol. III, with an English Translation (Loeb Classical Library): New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons (1931). Pp. xii+599. \$2.50.
- BEVAN, EDWYN R., *Aeschylus, The Seven Against Thebes*, Rendered into English Verse (Nelson Playbooks): London, Thomas Nelson and Sons (1931). Pp. 70. 9d.
- CHAPMAN, JOHN J., *Lucian, Plato, and Greek Morals*: Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co. (1931). Pp. vi+181. \$2.
- CLENDON, ARTHUR, AND VINCE, J. H., *The Clarendon Latin Course*, a Four-Year Course for Schools, First and Second Years: New York, Oxford University Press (1931). Pp. 288. \$1.25.
- Courses of Study for High Schools, Latin*, Issued by the Department of Public Instruction: Des Moines, State of Iowa (1931). Pp. 80.
- CUNLIFFE, RICHARD J., *Homeric Proper and Place Names*, a Supplement to a Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect: Glasgow, Blackie and Son (1931). Pp. 48. 7s. 6d.
- DEGRAFF, THELMA B., *Naevian Studies*: Geneva, N. Y., W. F. Humphrey (1931). Pp. x+96.
- DELAYEN, GASTON, *Cicero*, Translated from the French by Farrell Symons, with an Appreciation by Raymond Poincaré: New York, E. P. Dutton and Co. (1931). Pp. xvii+303. \$4.
- DINSMOOR, WILLIAM BELL, *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age*: Cambridge, Harvard University Press (1931). Pp. xviii+567, with 27 tables and 4 illustrations. \$7.50.
- FORD, CELIA, *First Latin Book*, New Series: New York, Henry Holt and Co. (1931). Pp. xv+476+57+li.

¹ Including books received at the Editorial Office of the CLASSICAL JOURNAL in Iowa City.

- FRANK, TENNEY, "Some Economic Aspects of Rome's Early Law," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* LXX (1931), 193-205: Lancaster, Pa., Lancaster Press.
- FRAZER, SIR JAMES GEORGE, *Studies in Greek Scenery, Legend, and History*, Selected from his Commentary on Pausanias' Description of Greece²: New York, Macmillan Co. (1931). Pp. x+419. \$3.50.
- GARDNER, EDMUND G., *Virgil in Italian Poetry* (British Academy Annual Italian Lecture): London, Oxford University Press (1931). Pp. 24. 1s. 6d.
- GLOVER, T. R., *Tertullian, Apology and De Spectaculis*, and RENDALL, GERALD H., *Minucius Felix*, with an English Translation (Loeb Classical Library): New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons (1931). Pp. xxvii+446. \$2.50.
- GOLDMAN, HETTY, *Excavations at Eutresis in Boeotia*: Cambridge, Harvard University Press (1931). Pp. xxi+294, with illustrations, 20 plates, panorama, and 2 plans. \$15.
- GRANGER, FRANK, *Vitruvius, On Architecture*, Vol. I, Edited from the Harleian MS 2767, with an English Translation (Loeb Classical Library): New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons (1931). Pp. xxxvi+317, with 8 plates. \$2.50.
- GREGORY, H., *Poems of Catullus*, Translated, with Drawings by Zhenya Gay: New York, Covici Friede (1931). Pp. ix+351. \$5.
- HABER, TOM BURNS, *Comparative Study of the Beowulf and the Aeneid*: Princeton, University Press (1931). Pp. viii+145. \$4.
- HADZSITS, GEORGE DEPUE, EDITOR, *Classical Studies in Honor of John C. Rolfe*: Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press (1931). Pp. x+352. \$3.
- HODGE, H. GROSE, *Murder at Larinum*, a Shortened Version of Cicero's Speech *Pro Cluentio* (Cambridge Elementary Classics): London, Cambridge University Press (1931). Pp. 96. 2s.
- HOLLAND, PHILEMON, *Suetonius, Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, Translated: New York, Modern Library (1931). Pp. 377. \$0.95.
- JONES, W. H. S., *Hippocrates*, Vol. IV, and *Heracleitus, On the Universe*, with an English Translation (Loeb Classical Library): New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons (1931). Pp. lix+519. \$2.50.
- JUNG, FRIEDRICH, *Hipponax Redivivus*: Bonn, Bonner Universitäts-Buchdruckerei Gebr. Scheur (1929). Pp. 76.
- KEAN, M., *Memoranda Latina, Word List, Syntax, Idioms, and Phrases*: Glasgow, Blackie and Son (1931). Pp. 144. 1s.
- KRAUSS, FRANKLIN BRUNELL, *An Interpretation of the Omens, Portents, and Prodigies Recorded by Livy, Tacitus, and Suetonius*: Philadelphia, privately printed (1930). Pp. 186.